DA
787
A3
L2

DA787.A3L2

MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS
IN CAPTIVITY.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

https://archive.org/details/maryqueenofscots00lead_0

Mary Queen of Scots.

MARY
QUEEN OF SCOTS
IN CAPTIVITY:

A NARRATIVE OF EVENTS

FROM

JANUARY, 1569, TO DECEMBER, 1584, WHILST GEORGE EARL OF SHREWSBURY WAS THE GUARDIAN OF THE SCOTTISH QUEEN.

BY

JOHN DANIEL LEADER,

FELLOW OF THE SOCIETY OF ANTIQUARIES.

SHEFFIELD: LEADER & SONS.
LONDON: GEORGE BELL & SONS, YORK STREET, W.C.

1880.

[*All rights reserved.*]

PREFACE.

THE author who ventures to approach that well-worn subject, the life of Mary, Queen of Scots, needs some hardihood and assurance. Yet I am emboldened in this adventure by the reflection, that the portion of the life of this remarkable woman dealt with in the following pages, is that which has least occupied the attention of historians and biographers. The stirring events of Mary's brief and troubled reign have been narrated in minutest detail; and we have many volumes dealing with the crisis of her fate from the discovery of the Babington conspiracy to the memorable scene in the castle hall at Fotheringhay. Controversy has raged, through three centuries, around her connection with the murder of Darnley, and nearly as long about her complicity with Babington in compassing the death of Queen Elizabeth. Both these events occur outside the range I have prescribed for myself. But Mary Stuart's was not a life marked by an occasional conspiracy. It was from first to last one long conspiracy of vast intricacy and varying interest.

The captivity of the Queen of Scots appears to divide itself into two periods; the first, from her landing in Cumberland to the discovery of the Ridolfi conspiracy; and the second, from the death of the Duke of Norfolk to her own execution. Between 1568 and 1571, Elizabeth had not fully abandoned the idea of restoring her sister and cousin to her crown. The plots of Mary and of the Duke of Norfolk to bring about a Spanish invasion, raise a rebellion, assassinate Elizabeth, and place themselves on the throne, opened the Queen of England's eyes to the danger she would run if the Queen of Scots regained her liberty. Norfolk suffered the just recompense of his treason, but Elizabeth could not, at that time, bring herself to sanction the trial and sentence of an anointed Queen, whose right divine it was her policy and interest to uphold. But she did recognise the necessity of keeping Mary a close prisoner; and during the dreary years between 1572 and 1586, restoration was never seriously contemplated. As a prisoner, Mary might have lived on, could she have been content to await the course of nature. But her spirit was high, and her friends were impatient. Into the toils of the Jesuit plot, in which Babington was a leading instrument, she eagerly fell; and when we remember that the chief feature and first aim of that conspiracy was the murder of Elizabeth, and

that Mary had lent herself to an approval of all its details, we cannot wonder that the conviction was forced upon the minds of English ministers, that Mary or Elizabeth must fall. The life of Mary meant the death of Elizabeth; and for the sake of herself and of her country, Elizabeth overcame her natural repugnance to arraign a sovereign at the bar of justice. Conviction having been obtained, the vacillation of the Queen seemed likely to avert execution of the sentence; but her ministers, thoroughly alarmed, never ceased to urge energetic action. On the one hand was the danger of retaining in the kingdom so formidable a head of the Catholic party, and on the other the warm resentment of the Catholic powers, certain to follow her execution. It was a choice of evils, but the English ministers preferred to encounter all the rage of Spain and of France, rather than see the broken web of conspiracy repaired, and another attempt made to overturn the throne and the religion of England. The warrant once signed, the Privy Council ventured to act without consulting the Queen, and we can well believe that Elizabeth's surprise and indignation at hearing of the execution were not entirely feigned.

In the following pages, I have endeavoured to bring together the scattered threads of information to be found among contemporary letters and published documents, and weave them into a narrative;

but most of all, I am indebted to the archives of the Public Record Office, under the guidance of Thorpe's Calendar, and the able assistance of Mr. Charles Trice Martin, F.S.A., for much hitherto unpublished matter. My design throughout has been to fill up what seemed to be an unsupplied link in the chain of Queen Mary's life. The work has been done in brief, irregular, and often widely separated intervals of leisure, snatched from the ever growing and insatiable demands of the profession of journalism; and some of the many defects with which I am conscious the book abounds will, I hope, be attributed, in charity, to this circumstance.

The period treated of embraces the year 1582, when Pope Gregory XIII. introduced the Reformed or New Calendar. The change was first made in Rome, Spain, and Portugal, in October, 1582, when the 5th became the 15th of that month. In France the change took place under letters patent from Henry III., and the 10th became the 20th December, 1582. In England, the Calendar remained unreformed till 1752; and the Queen of Scots continued to the end of her life to date according to the old style. The dates, therefore, throughout this volume, save in the case of the French and Spanish despatches after 1582, are those of the old style. It is necessary, also, in order to avoid confusion,

to bear in mind the English mode of computing the legal year from the 25th March. Thus all dates of letters and documents issuing between January 1st and March 24th, are apparently one year behind the historical year. Where this happens, I have either used the historical year, or have indicated both years, thus 1569-70; the latter date being that of the historical year.

Since the volume has been in the press, I have been enabled to add three portraits, besides that of the Queen of Scots, with which it was originally intended to illustrate the book. The frontispiece is reproduced, by the kind permission of his Grace the Duke of Devonshire and of the Marquis of Hartington, from the famous "Sheffield Portrait," preserved in Hardwick Hall. The original is painted on oak panel, and represents the Queen, in her thirty-sixth year, as anything but the beautiful woman traditionally described. She has, also, a very decided cast in the right eye, which the artist, with some skill, has rendered less obvious by representing her as looking towards the left. The upper portion of the picture, down to the hands, is reproduced in this volume with striking fidelity; but the lower part of the dress, the table on the right, and the carpet on which the Queen stands, though approximately correct, are not entirely so, owing to the difficulty of expressing in photography

so dark an image as this old painting shows. The work has been skilfully executed by Messrs. Ad. Braun & Co., of Paris, from photographs prepared by Mr. J. Stringfellow, of Sheffield.

The portraits of the Earl and Countess of Shrewsbury, and of the Duke of Norfolk, copied in exact *facsimile* by the Woodburytype process, are from old engravings in the extensive and valuable collection of Stephen I. Tucker, Esq., Somerset Herald, and will, I trust, add interest to the volume.

To many friends I have been indebted for assistance and advice; but cannot refrain from acknowledging great obligations to the Rev. Dr. Gatty, Vicar of Ecclesfield and Sub-dean of York, without whose kindly and encouraging counsel it is probable this volume would never have seen the light. Such as it is, I now lay it before an indulgent public, and if the result is to throw any light on an interesting and critical period in our country's history, my aspirations will be satisfied.

Sheffield, August, 1880.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

PAGE

Queen of Scots lands at Workington—Communicates with Elizabeth—Removed to Carlisle—Her apartments at the castle—Her scanty apparel—Earl of Murray sends coffers from Loch Leven—Lord Scroope and Sir Francis Knollys sent to attend on the Queen of Scots—Knollys's opinion of her—Mary's train of attendants—Elizabeth and Mary—Want of a plain resolution—Queen of Scots threatens to seek aid from France and Spain—Removed to Bolton Castle—The conference at York—Mary's position—Elizabeth's advantage - - - - 1-12

CHAPTER II.

Resolution to entrust Queen of Scots to the care of the Earl of Shrewsbury—Shrewsbury's two wives—His lineage—John Talbot, the Great Earl—Shrewsbury's portrait—His various mansions—Elizabeth Countess of Shrewsbury—Her marriages—Family unions of Talbots and Cavendishes—Tutbury to be Mary's place of residence—Knollys weary of his charge—Death of his wife—Tutbury Castle—Mary's description of it—The route from Bolton to Tutbury—Dealings of Norfolk and Murray—Horses lent by the Bishop of Durham—From Bolton to Ripon—Ripon to Weatherby—Weatherby to Pontefract—Pontefract to Rotherham—Rotherham town and college—Proposal to stay at Sheffield abandoned—Illness of Lady Livingstone—Rotherham to Chesterfield—Mr. Foljambe's house—Illness of the Queen of Scots—Arrival at Tutbury—Queen of Scots transferred to the care of Shrewsbury—Shrewsbury's allowance or diet money—Reduction of the number of Mary's attendants—Letter from Elizabeth—Mary writes to Cecil—Her attitude—The Bishop of Ross—Thomas Bishop—Communings with the Spanish Ambassador—The little Court at Tutbury—Visit of Nicholas White—His graphic letter—Mary and Lady Shrewsbury—Illness and trouble of the Queen of Scots—Shrewsbury's anxiety—He begins to weary of his charge—Mary's stormy letter to Elizabeth—Threatens to seek foreign aid—Queen of Scots strictly guarded—La Mothe Fénélon - 13-50

CHAPTER III.

PAGE

Wingfield Manor—Its situation and structure—Queen of Scots removed from Tutbury to Wingfield—Enjoys greater liberty—Her indiscretion—Disasters to her cause in Scotland—Sends envoys to London—Hopes of release—Mary's illness—Symptons similar to those at Jedburgh—Sudden recovery—Project of marriage with the Duke of Norfolk—Physicians sent to Wingfield—Removal to Chatsworth and return to Wingfield—Shrewsbury's illness—Alarm at Court—Lady Shrewsbury assumes the command—Shrewsbury's danger and recovery—Sir John Zouche assists Shrewsbury—Shrewsbury visits Buxton without permission, and is reprimanded—Excuses himself - - - - 51-72

CHAPTER IV.

Mary's desire to leave Wingfield, for the benefit of her health—Shrewsbury obtains permission to take her to Sheffield—Troubled with gout—The Norfolk marriage—Action of certain of the nobility—Ross's negotiations result in agreement on "heads and articles"—The Queen of Scots' letter to "my Lords of the Nobility"—Favourable prospects—Mary hopeful, but suspicious—Her letter to Norfolk—The marriage scheme exploded—Stringent orders sent to Wingfield—Huntingdon and Hereford to assist Shrewsbury—Proposed journey to Sheffield abandoned—Mary returns to Tutbury—An epoch in her captivity—More stringent restraint—Huntingdon's instructions to supersede Shrewsbury—He is associated with Shrewsbury and Hereford—Mary's objection to Huntingdon—Shrewsbury's remonstrances—Norfolk committed to the Tower—Mary questioned by her keepers—Her miserable condition—Her room entered by men with pistolets—Complaints of Shrewsbury's treatment of Huntingdon—He defends himself—Suspicions against Lady Shrewsbury—Shrewsbury's letter to Cecil—Elizabeth's cautions—Mary's letter to La Mothe written without light—King of France intercedes on behalf of Queen of Scots—Departure of Huntingdon—Queen of Scots better treated—Supervision of her correspondence—Her sickness returns—Outbreak of the Northern rebellion—Alarm at Tutbury—Rebels at Tadcaster—Queen of Scots removed to Coventry—Lodged at an inn—Huntingdon rejoins Shrewsbury—Queen of Scots removed to a private house—Differences and contraries between Shrewsbury and Huntingdon—Huntingdon's reports—Collapse of the rebellion—Queen of Scots returns to Tutbury—Condition of the common people - - 73-109

CHAPTER V.

1570 opens with gloom for Queen of Scots—Present of hawks for Shrewsbury—Mary professes affection for Norfolk—Her love letters—Assas-

PAGE

sination of Murray—Lent sermons by the Bishop of Coventry—Imprisonment of the Bishop of Ross—Plans of escape made and unmade—An alarm at Tutbury—Secret communications—Mary's sickness—Proposed removal to Chatsworth—Mary stimulating Norfolk to action—Elizabeth's troops harry the Scotch border—Negotiations for a treaty between Mary and Elizabeth—Mary hesitates about terms—Her letter to Norfolk—Excommunication of Elizabeth—Chatsworth—Mary's removal thither—Bishop of Ross arrives—Mary's position and prospects—Ross returns to London—Renewed restraints—A French envoy visits Chatsworth—Mary eager for the treaty—Its stipulations—Maitland's advice—Plots for Mary's escape—Elizabeth's plain spoken letter—Cecil and Mildmay negotiate with Mary at Chatsworth—Ross's letter to Norfolk—Cecil reports Elizabeth's directions to Shrewsbury—Death of John Beaton—Interred at Edensor—Removal to Sheffield resolved on - 110-139

CHAPTER VI.

Departure from Chatsworth—Ride over the Moors—First sight of Sheffield—Sheffield Castle—Harrison's survey of the Manor—Sheffield Park: its timber—Sheffield Lodge or Manor House—Inventory of the furniture—A small Lodge, perhaps the only building yet standing in which the Queen of Scots was detained—Shrewsbury's coat of arms—The view from the Lodge—Queen of Scots very sick—Physicians sent from London—The symptoms—Mary's anxiety for the treaty—She is partly convalescent, 140-162

CHAPTER VII.

Severe weather—Departure of the Physicians—Appeals for the treaty—Queen of Scots' servants reduced in number—Shrewsbury cautioned to be circumspect—Mary's urgent request for the treaty—Sends Lord Seaton to negotiate with the Duke of Alva—Urges an invasion or preparation for invasion of Scotland—Parliament and the succession—Robert Ridolfi—Hopes of Spanish help—Mary and Norfolk instruct Ridolfi to deal with the Pope and the King of Spain for aid—Cecil created Baron Burghley—Mary prays Burghley to forward the treaty—Complains of the reduction of her servants—Submission to Elizabeth—Capture of Dumbarton Castle—Important papers found there—The plot with the Duke of Alva and Spain disclosed—Charles Bailly, a secret messenger, arrested—Ciphered letters—William Herlle, the spy—Bailly tortured—Important discoveries—Projects for getting Mary out of Sheffield—A plot at Easter—Hickford, Norfolk's secretary, examined—Shrewsbury cautioned—His new regulations for the household—Names of Mary's servants—Hawkins's sham treachery—George Fitzwilliam employed to deceive

PAGE

Mary—Shrewsbury solicits the wardship of Babington—Anthony Babington and his family—Mary's kindness to George Douglas—His matrimonial projects - - - - - - - - - 163-191

CHAPTER VIII.

Queen of Scots informed of the imprisonment of Ross and the discovery of her plots—Burghley's letter on the subject—Shrewsbury instructed to question his charge—Mary's answer—Her pen busy writing for foreign aid—She declares Elizabeth holds the crown against all right, divine and human—Her sickness and weakness—Ridolfi at Madrid—Elizabeth's marriage negotiations with Anjou—Arrest of Francis Rolleston, of Lea —Strict watch and ward—The precautions described—The Duke of Norfolk's practices discovered—His arrest—Proceedings of the old Countess of Northumberland—Her resort to Wortley's house, at Wortley —The Queen of Scots' servants reduced in number—A combination among them—A practiser imprisoned in Sheffield—Mary's letter to her banished servants—Matters fall out ill against the Queen of Scots—The Duke of Norfolk's submission—Ciphered letters seized at Sheffield— The growing difficulties of Norfolk—Imputations on Lady Shrewsbury— Her exculpation—The proceedings of Ridolfi abroad—The scope of the plot—Elizabeth and her rival—Further reduction of Mary's servants— She writes to Elizabeth from her "close prison at Sheffield"—Her letter to La Mothe—Permitted to take an airing on the leads of the house— Begs for a priest—Remonstrances of the French ambassador—Shrews- bury says, "They shall buy her dearly that shall get her forth of my hands"—Channels of secret correspondence—Removal from Sheffield in contemplation—Buchannan's "Detection"—Mary's indignation about it —Her letter to the Bishop of Ross—Stimulates her friends beyond the sea—Her health—The Bishop of Ross's cook - - - - - 192-229

CHAPTER IX.

Trial of the Duke of Norfolk—Shrewsbury leaves for London to preside as High Steward—Arrangements in Westminster Hall—Verdict and sen- tence—Sir Ralph Sadler in charge at Sheffield—His graphic letters— Shrewsbury's precautions—The order of watching and warding—Sadler's further precautions—His interview with the Queen of Scots—Lady Shrewsbury and the Queen walk in the courtyard—Mary's correspon- dence—Her reception of the news of Norfolk's condemnation—Her grief—Her fasting and praying—Sadler anxious to be relieved—Shrews- bury's return—He busies himself in tracing and intercepting the Queen of Scots' correspondence—Discovery of a nest of conspirators—Lord Hunsdon's warning—Mary's unquietness—A cunning device—Mary

PAGE

grieved with her old disease—Her alarm at the prospect of a Parliament —Her protests—Desires to go to Buxton—Sends a present to Elizabeth —Treaty concluded with France—Resolutions of Parliament and Convocation—Execution of Norfolk—Mary's grief for the Duke's death—Commissioners sent to Sheffield—Mary's answers to the articles of accusation—How Shrewsbury entertained a visitor - - - - 230-264

CHAPTER X.

August 15th, 1572—Money sent to the Queen of Scots—The visit to Buxton deferred—Burghley appointed Lord Treasurer—Removal to Sheffield Lodge contemplated, but abandoned—Strange news out of France—The Massacre of St Bartholomew—Straight keeping at Sheffield —General apprehension in England—Shrewsbury made Earl Marshal—His prisoner "in sure keeping"—Illness of Elizabeth—Her letter to Shrewsbury—Disgraceful negotiations with the Scots—The Scots not to be caught—Mary's grief and melancholy—Slanders against Shrewsbury—Elizabeth satisfied—Mary's position - - - - - 265-283

CHAPTER XI.

Shrewsbury hunts out conjurers and mass-mongers—Letters for the Queen of Scots—Money employed for her secret practices—Complaints of the plunder of her dowry—Devices for her escape—Shrewsbury's assurance to Elizabeth—Mary receives money from France, and asks for more—Removal to Sheffield Manor, otherwise called Sheffield Lodge—Gilbert Talbot reports if she were a flea or a mouse, she could not escape —Dutiful submission of Shrewsbury's sons—Shrewsbury's affection for his wife—Its contrast with their later relationships—The fall of Edinburgh Castle — Mary's French dowry — Shrewsbury's diet money—Proposal that Mary should defray her own charges—French dealings with the dowry—Proposed visit to Buxton—Mary removed to Chatsworth—New alarms and renewed precautions—Mary at length removed to Buxton—Dr. Jones' description of the Baths—Amusements of the place—Mary at the Baths—The benefit she derived from the waters—Her complaint of lack of servants and want of exercise—The return to Sheffield—Release of the Bishop of Ross - - - - - - 284-307

CHAPTER XII.

Opening of 1574—The prisoner safe—Letters still reach her—William Wharton and his doings—Forgery of letters suggested—Another contrivance—Mary's pleas for money—Her needle work—Her explanations and requests—Thomas Corker, Vicar of Rotherham and Rector of Handsworth, spreads slanders against Shrewsbury — Shrewsbury's

PAGE

anxiety to be relieved of his charge—Corker imprisoned—A revival of the slanders—Shrewsbury's indignation—Mary's fear of poison—Prayers in the vulgar tongue—A religious difficulty—Dealings in silk - 308-327

CHAPTER XIII.

Measles at Sheffield Castle—Mary's dowry plundered—Present of embroidery to Elizabeth—La Mothe anounces its acceptance—Mary sends presents to Leicester—She is making a head-dress for Elizabeth—Sends confections—Rollett's illness—Mary's mode of letter writing—Desires Unicorn's horn—Desires to visit Buxton—Spends a month there—Alexander Hamilton's practices—His fortunate escape—Henry Cockyn a practiser—Mary grants him a pension—Examinations and confessions of Cockyn and his accomplices—Mary's prison amusements—Rollett's dangerous illness—Mary desires patterns of dresses—Leicester a suitor for the hand of the Queen of Scots—How Mary received his advances—Rollett's illness and death—Shrewsbury searches his coffers—Rollett buried at Sheffield—Mary removed to Sheffield Lodge—Her love of little animals—The Lennox-Cavendish marriage—How it was brought about—Its consequences—Elizabeth's anger—Shrewsbury's excuses—Suspicions against the Queen of Scots—Lady Lennox in confinement—Mary falls back upon presents and fair speeches—Shrewsbury suspects a greater matter—Death of Charles IX. and accession of Henry III., in France—Death of the Cardinal of Lorraine—Effect of these changes on the position of the Queen of Scots—The portraiture of Mary Stuart 328-353

CHAPTER XIV.

French court urging Queen of Scots to grant title of King to her son—Her complaints to the Duchess of Nemours—Practisers arrested and examined—Elizabeth's mislike of strangers resorting to Sheffield—An Earthquake shakes the Castle—Mary's kindness to her servants—Presents night dresses to Elizabeth—Secretary Nau enters Mary's service—Renewed vigilance in searching out the channels of Mary's correspondence—La Mothe's conversation with Elizabeth—Proposal that Mary should bear her own charges—La Mothe glad to see the two Queens on better terms—As France cools, Mary looks more to Spain—The Spanish Ambassador's opinion of the Archbishop of Glasgow and of the Bishop of Ross—Philip speaks fair, but does nothing—Mary's indisposition—Burghley visits Buxton—Mary's expressed intention to restore the Catholic religion—Reduction of Shrewsbury's diet money—French dealings with Mary's dowry—Consequences of the Lennox-Cavendish marriage—New interests for Lady Shrewsbury—Beginning of family differences—La Mothe Fénélon - - - - - - - - 354-368

CHAPTER XV.

PAGE

French King and his brother referring their differences to Elizabeth—Queen of Scots' health—Burghley's caution—Walsingham appropriates certain hoods—A curious watch sent to Mary—She procures dogs for the King of France—The English Parliament—Elizabeth's heir—Queen of Scots removed to Sheffield Lodge—Death of Bothwell—His alleged dying declaration—Projected interview between Mary and Elizabeth—Mary visits Buxton—Returns to Sheffield—Death of Charles Earl of Lennox—Marriage negotiations between Andrew Beaton and Mary Seaton—Death of Beaton—Mary removes to Sheffield Lodge—The wild schemes of Don John—Mary's liberty abridged—She makes a Will—Visit of Du Verger—curious letter from Lady Shrewsbury to her husband—Mary visits Chatsworth—Leicester at Buxton—Sounds the nobility with reference to his marriage with Elizabeth—Negotiations between Mary and Leicester—Extraordinary letter from Elizabeth to Shrewsbury—Nau visits Buxton—Shrewsbury's reply to Elizabeth—Burghley again at Buxton—Shrewsbury sends him a plan of a Lodge—Mary writes to Dr. William Allen—Her double dealing—Quarrels in the Shrewsbury family—Gilbert Talbot's letter to Lady Shrewsbury—Death of Gilbert's only son—Portraits of the Queen of Scots—Type of the genuine portraits—Chalmers' composition portrait—Nau's self seeking—Intrigues of the Archbishop of Glasgow—Rumours of Mary's escape—Shrewsbury cautioned—Burghley returns to London—He calms the alarm of the Council—Queen of Scots again in Sheffield—She stimulates the Pope to activity—Her ciphered letters fall into the hands of Walsingham—A comet appears over Windsor—Fears of coming change—Conflicting influences - - - - - - - - - - 369-403

CHAPTER XVI.

Elizabeth encourages the rebels in the Low Countries—Mary pleads with her French relatives for friendly interposition—Instructions prepared for Mary's removal to Ashby—Shrewsbury protests the faithfulness of his service—The removal not carried out—Death of Margaret, Countess of Lennox—James VI. and Arabella Stuart claimants for the honours of the house of Lennox—Mary's friends abroad fancy an accommodation may be effected—Vain dreams—M. de Gondy badly received by Elizabeth—Mary complains of hard treatment and want of exercise—Her letters to the King of Spain and others fall into the hands of Elizabeth—French and Spanish diplomacy—Du Verger visits the Queen of Scots—She spends August and September at Chatsworth—The English succession the dream of Mary's life—Mary's cook troubles her—The impudence of these low people—Queen of Scots removed to Sheffield Manor—Her religious meditations—Her fair professions to Elizabeth—

PAGE

Her intrigues with France, Spain, and Germany—The Bishop of Ross at Rome—Negotiations at Paris—Philip urged to send a special envoy into Scotland—Elizabeth's marriage negotiations—Philip's caution and perplexity—Gilbert Talbot reports court gossip—Presents from Shrewsbury to the Lord Treasurer and others—Gilbert thinks some gift to the Lord Chancellor would be well bestowed—Prosperous state of the French marriage negotiations—Odds laid against the marriage—Mary permitted to send Nau into Scotland—Failure of his mission—Queen of Scots reported to be more content and at ease—Complaints against Shrewsbury for absenting himself from Sheffield—Queen of Scots removed to Chatsworth—Mary and her son—Mauvissière instructed to assist the Queen of Scots with prudent consideration—Her great hope in Spain—She urges Philip with enticing reports—Mary returns to Sheffield Manor—Esmé Stuart, Earl of Lennox—Arrival of the Duke of Alençon in England—Mary's opinion of the French marriage - - 404-425

CHAPTER XVII.

Mary's high resolve—Her dealings with England, France and Spain—Her representations to the Duke of Guise—To Philip—Philip still cautious—France and Spain striving for ascendancy—Mary seeks to stand well with the expectant bridegroom—She seeks to be ready for any contingency—Shrewsbury's indisposition—Intrigues to get the Queen of Queen of Scots out of his hands—Mary offers suggestions to the King of France—Her dealings with Spain become known to the English Council—She appeals to Elizabeth—Her hope of gaining Burghley—State of her health—Burgoing, the physician's, report—Secret messengers arrested—Mary's dowry mismanaged—Her anxiety for liberty—Papal intrigues in England and Scotland—The Jesuit mission—The D'Aubigny and Morton parties in Scotland—A delicate negotiation with France and Spain—Balancing advantages—Shrewsbury's grievance—The diet money—His cark and care—Mary and the Shrewsbury family—Elizabeth objects to the resort of Shrewsbury's children where the Queen of Scots might be—Mary taken to Buxton—Accident in mounting her horse—Strictness of her seclusion at Buxton—Favourable effect of the baths on her health—The new sickness—Mary returns to Sheffield well and hearty—Present to the Duke of Guise—Penal laws enforced against the Catholics—Mary remonstrates against the mismanagement of her dowry—Her religious reflections on adversity—The diet money—Love making in Shrewsbury's household—The lovers discharged—The fall of Morton—Mary's satisfaction thereat—Morton's execution—The association of Mary and James in the crown of Scotland—Mary appoints the Duke of Guise her agent in Scotland—Shrewsbury and the diet money—His shabby treatment by Elizabeth—His remonstrances—He is said

PAGE

to be buying estates—Complaints about Mary's diet—The health of the Queen of Scots—Sad description of her enfeebled body—Dealings with Spain—De Tassis, the new Spanish Envoy—The far reaching plot—De Tassis regards the scheme as absurd—Elizabeth's marriage negotiations —Queen of Scots inconvenienced about her secret correspondence— Gives formal instructions about her dowry—Desires a fixed income, guaranteed by solvent merchants—Her letter to the Pope—France urges Queen of Scots to grant title of King to her son—Her double dealings—New restrictions on her liberty—Jesuit intrigues in Scotland —Robert Beale, clerk of the Council, sent to Sheffield—His interview with the Queen of Scots' secretary—Nau's professions—Beale negotiates with Mary—Shrewsbury's grievances—Mary's sickness—Her professions of devotion to Elizabeth—Beale thinks the opportunity favourable for securing substantial concessions—A curious piece of acting—Shrewsbury's bluntness—Beale thinks physicians might properly be sent—Beale urged to draw specific proposals from the Queen of Scots—His small success—His report to Walsingham—Beale returns to London—Mary's memorial of requests—The rebatement of Shrewsbury's allowance 426-487

CHAPTER XVIII.

Negotiations in abeyance—Mary's coach sent to Sheffield—Permitted to take the air abroad—Sheffield park—Queen of Scots very weak, but void of pain—Shrewsbury applies for a grant of land in fee farm— Death of Elizabeth Countess of Lennox—Gilbert Talbot's wife confined —Shrewsbury's melancholy and bitterness—He is most quiet with fewest women—Complains of spies—Negotiations between Mary and Elizabeth renewed—An attempt to draw Mary into engagements—Her wise caution—She plays off England, France, and Spain—On Spain her hopes centred—The Jesuit plotters—The proposed association—Esmé Stuart's professions—His demands—De Tassis regards them as absurd —State of religion in Scotland—Esmé Stuart's letter to Queen of Scots —Her comments upon his plan—Philip's desire for precise information —Cross purposes amongst the conspirators—Esmé Stuart's demands modified—Mary's opinion of the Jesuits—Philip advises the holy men to try a little preaching—Shrewsbury seeks permission to visit court—Two physicians sent to Sheffield—The Queen of Scots taken to Buxton—The raid of Ruthven—Shrewsbury obtains permission to go to Court—Death of Francis Lord Talbot—The visit to London postponed—Elizabeth's suspicions against Shrewsbury—Du Ruisseau visits the Queen of Scots —He helps forward the foreign plot—Curious and suggestive expression about Shrewsbury—Arrest of Du Ruisseau—Restraint of the Queen of Scots—Her astonishment—Heart-burnings between Elizabeth and Mary —Mary's appeal to Elizabeth—The care with which it was written—

PAGE

Philip's view of the raid of Ruthven—A French remonstrance—Mary desires the exercise of her religion—La Mothe Fénélon and De Maigneville sent into Scotland—Davidson accompanies them—Uncertainty and perplexity - - - - - - - - - - - 488-516

CHAPTER XIX.

The Queen of Scots again proposes the association—Draws up letters patent—Fruitless negotiations—Mass book found in Shrewsbury's ship—Proposals to send the ship out with Captain Carlile—Shrewsbury orders upholstery and dress—Joined with Beale in a commission to receive certain matters from Mary—Lengthy instructions—Beale returns to Sheffield—Finds the Queen of Scots waxen far grosser—Mary objects that there is no letter of credence—Discussion however continued—Mary sets forth her requirements—The proposals appeared to Beale to be fair—Queen of Scots fully persuaded of James' affection towards her—Shrewsbury at a cock fight—Elizabeth approves what Beale has done—Shrewsbury and Beale accompany the Queen of Scots in the garden and park—Beale and Nau converse in the garden—Beale returns to Court, but comes back to Sheffield with Sir Walter Mildmay—Queen of Scots anxious for some conclusion—Mildmay recalled—Mary's grief and tears—Arabella Stuart's message to Elizabeth—Mary's dowry—Her opinion of Walsingham—Beale sent to London with letters—Shrewsbury and Mildmay take the Queen of Scots to Worksop—Mendoza's opinion of the situation—Summary of the treaty—Mary's conspiracies - - - - - - - - - - - 517-531

CHAPTER XX.

The Catholic cause—Philip and the Pope—Spanish disgust at the Pope's niggardliness—The question of assassination—France endeavouring to bring the Scotch factions into accord—Walsingham corrupts the French ambassador's secretary—Betrayal of Mary Stuart's correspondence—Archbishop Douglas a double traitor—Queen of Scots visits Worksop—Her letter to Bess Pierrepoint—Her rheumatism—Gilbert Talbot and his father—Meeting of Shrewsbury and Rutland a ground of suspicion—Charles Paget's secret mission—John Somerville's indiscretion discloses the plot—Arrest of Throgmorton and other conspirators—Flight of Lord Paget and Charles Arundel—Torture and execution of prisoners—Mendoza compromised—Ordered to quit England—Mendoza's family and career—Loyalty of the English people—Elizabeth's popularity 532-546

CHAPTER XXI.

PAGE

Slanders of Lady Shrewsbury against her husband and the Queen of Scots —Indignation of Mary—Her threats of retaliation—Receipt for secret writing—Lady Shrewsbury's ambitious designs for Arabella Stuart—Her dealings with the Queen of Scots' ciphered correspondence—The scandal letter—Labanoff's opinion of it—The text—Hunter's opinion—Date of the letter—Striking illustration of the manners of the time—Mary's professions of ignorance of the conspirators—Elizabeth not to be thus easily deceived—Mary's letter to Mauvissière—Renewed protestations of innocence—Elizabeth's reply—Mary's dissatisfaction thereat—Shrewsbury's professions of loyalty—Mary's letters to Mauvissière and Elizabeth—Shrewsbury's desire to visit Court—His release arranged for—Mary to be removed to Melbourne Castle—Elizabeth's formal order for Shrewsbury's discharge—Plans once more changed—Waad and Maron sent to Sheffield—Their conferences with the Queen of Scots—Maron's requests about her dowry agreed to—Conversations with Waad—Mary's mean opinion of Scotch honesty—Her message to Elizabeth—Beale sent back to Sheffield—He treats with the Queen of Scots—His report not deemed satisfactory—Mary's professions to Elizabeth, and dealings with foreigners—Opinion of De Tassis—Death of Anjou—Mary removed to Buxton—Her letter to Mauvissière—Her farewell to Buxton—Sadler sent to relieve Shrewsbury—Arrives at Sheffield—Conflicting orders and delays—Shrewsbury's family quarrels—Death of Leicester's son—Shrewsbury's letters to Leicester and Burghley—Sadler's interview with the Queen of Scots—Her professions of devotion to Elizabeth's wishes—Slackness of the Posts—Departure from Sheffield - - - - - - - - - - - 547-591

CHAPTER XXII.

The journey to Wingfield—Talk between the Queen of Scots and Mr. Somer—Sadler reports arrival at Wingfield—Shrewsbury sets out for London—His reception at Court—Approval of his service by the Privy Council—Sadler's precautions—Mary's health—Her anxiety for the treaty—Suspicions against Shrewsbury's servants—Prosecution of scandal-mongers—Communications between the two Queens—Questions and answers about Mary's quarters, diet, and service—Shrewsbury's final release—Preparations for removal to Tutbury—Somer's report on the state of the House—Sir Amias Poulet appointed keeper—Departure from Wingfield—State of the roads—Halt for the night at Derby—Mary sleeps there at the house of an ancient widow—Arrival at Tutbury—Mary's letter to Burghley—Conclusion - - - - - 592-621

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.

MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS, AGED 36 - - - - - *Frontispiece.*

GEORGE TALBOT, 6TH EARL OF SHREWSBURY - - - *to face p.* 14

ELIZABETH, COUNTESS OF SHREWSBURY - - - - - *to face p.* 16

THOMAS HOWARD, DUKE OF NORFOLK - - - - - *to face p.* 232

MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS.

1568-1584.

CHAPTER I.

MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS, flying before the face of her victorious rebels, landed at Workington, in Cumberland, on Sunday, the 16th May, 1568, bringing to the Government of England long years of anxiety and trouble. Obtaining shelter at Workington Hall, she wrote at once to Queen Elizabeth, explaining her pitiable condition, and appealing to her royal sister for protection and support.[1] At the same time, Richard Lowther, deputy governor of Carlisle, despatched to Sir William Cecil such an account as he thought it needful to give of the arrival of the Scottish Queen, and expressed his intention of detaining her until Elizabeth's pleasure should be known.[2] The arrival had been sudden, and proved very embarrassing to the local authorities. Mr. Lowther deemed the prize his own; but the Queen was also claimed by the Earl of Northumberland, on the ground that she had landed within his "liberties." Between these contending magnates high words passed; but Lowther was supported at

[1] *Labanoff* "Recueil des Lettres de Marie Stuart," vol. 2, p. 73.

[2] Record Office.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, vol. 1., No. 2.

Court, and Northumberland's wrath passed harmlessly away. He was firmly but courteously told to leave his pretensions to the decision of Queen Elizabeth;[1] and in the meantime the safe custody of the Queen of Scots was seen to.

In a letter written afterwards at Bolton, Knollys described minutely the precautions taken at this time, and the situation of the Queen's apartments. He says:—

"The band was divided into five parts, so that the watch and wards came about every fifth night and every fifth day, of the which watch and wards we had five governors: the first was Mr. Reade, and William Knollys for his learning accompanied him; the second was Mr. Morton, the third was Mr. Wilford, the fourth was Barrett, Mr. Reade's lieutenant, and the fifth was West, his ensign bearer, a very sufficient and careful man also. This Queen's chamber at Carlisle had a window looking out towards Scotland, the bars whereof being filed asunder, out of the same she might have been let down, and then she had plain grounds before her to pass into Scotland. But near unto the same window we found an old postern door, that was dammed up with a rampire of earth of the inner side, of 20 foot broad and 30 foot deep, between two walls: for the commodity of which postern for our sally to that window with ready watch and ward, we did cut into that rampire in form of stair with a turning about down to the said postern, and so opened the same, without the which device we could not have watched and warded this Queen there so safely as we did. Although there was another window of her chamber for passing into an orchard within the town wall, and so to have slipped over the town wall, that was very dangerous; but these matters I can better tell you at my return, upon a rude platte [plan] that I have made thereof."[2]

[1] Knollys to Northumberland, May 25.—*MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. 1., No. 11.

[2] Knollys to Cecil, 16th July.—*Wright's* "Queen Elizabeth and her Times," v. 1, p. 290.

In her flight from Loch Leven, Mary carried with her none of the trappings of royalty, nor even changes of raiment, and the few days she spent in Scotland were too full of stirring events to allow much thought for dress. It is not surprising, therefore, that when the fugitive Queen stepped on English soil she was quite without change of garments. On the 17th May, Lowther conducted his prisoner-guest to Cockermouth, and next day to Carlisle, with all the outward honours due to her rank. He noticed that her attire was "very mean," nor did she appear to have much money, for he had himself to defray the cost of her journey and provide horses for the whole party.[1] At this time the English Government made great show of kindly treatment, and supplied as well as it could, the wants of the fugitives. Lady Scrope, sister of the Duke of Norfolk, was appointed to attend on the Queen, and Lord Scrope and Sir Francis Knollys left the Court on the 20th May, with letters of comfort from Queen Elizabeth to her good sister. At their coming to Carlisle, these envoys "declared the Queen's grief of mind for the many mishaps" of the Queen of Scots, "and therewith gave her an assurance of her friendship and favour." "The Scottish Queen took great comfort," and sent up Lords Herries and Fleming to London to treat with the Queen of England. Orders were given that the train of the Queen of Scotland "should be entertained with all honour and courtesy, and a free liberty given to her servants or subjects to come to Carlisle to speak with her, and to return into Scotland at their

[1] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. 1., Nos. 5 and 9.

pleasure;" but these orders were never carried out, and we soon find Mary complaining of the obstruction and detention of her servants.[1]

The deficiencies of Mary's wardrobe were supplied, after some delay, from Scotland;[2] and meantime we gather from various letters the impression produced by the Queen on the courtiers and servants of Elizabeth. Sir Francis Knollys wrote to Cecil soon after his arrival: "Surely she is a rare woman; for as no flattery can abuse her, so no plain speech seems to offend her, if she thinks the speaker an honest man."[3] In a letter from Scrope and Knollys, addressed to Queen Elizabeth the day after their arrival at Carlisle, describing the first interview with Queen Mary, they say:—"We found her in her answers to have an eloquent tongue, and a discreet head, and it seemeth by her doings she hath stout courage and liberal heart adjoined thereunto."[4] Writing to Cecil on the 11th June, Knollys says:—

"And yet this lady and princess is a notable woman. She seemeth to regard no ceremonious honour beside the acknowledging of her estate regal. She showeth a disposition to speak much, to be bold, to be pleasant, and to be very familiar. She

[1] *Chalmers'* "Life of Mary Queen of Scots," v. 1., p. 282. Mary to Elizabeth, June 26.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. 1., No. 22.

[2] Knollys writing to Cecil from Carlisle, "the 7th of Julye, at five of the clocke after noone," says: "My Lord of Murray hath sent, by our messenger, to this Queen three coffers of apparel, but because her Grace saith that never a gown is sent her hereby, but one of taffita, and that the rest is but cloaks and coverings for saddles, and sleaves, and partlettes, and qweyffes, and such like trinkets, therefore we have sent to my Lord of Murray again for her desired apparel remaining in Loch Leven; but she doth offer our messengers nothing for all their paines and charges. Wherefore, her Highness is like to bear the charge thereof also."—*Wright*, vol. 1., p. 288. The arrival of the second messenger at Bolton, with five small cart loads and four horse loads, is mentioned in a letter from Knollys to Cecil, dated July 20.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. 1., No. 27.

[3] *Chalmers*, v. 1, p. 285. [4] *Wright*, v. 1, p. 277.

showeth a great desire to be avenged of her enemies; she showeth a readiness to expose herself to all perils in hope of victory; she delighteth much to hear of hardiness and valliancy, commending by name all approved hardy men of her country, although they be her enemies; and she commendeth no cowardness even in her friends. The thing that most she thirsteth after is victory, and it seemeth to be indifferent to her to have her enemies diminish, either by the sword of her friends, or by the liberal promises and rewards of her purse, or by division and quarrels raised among themselves; so that for victory's sake, pain and perils seemeth pleasant unto her, and in respect of victory, wealth and all things seemeth to her contemptuous and vile. Now, what is to be done with such a lady and princess, or whether a princess and lady be to be nourished in one's bosom, or whether it be good to halt and dissemble with such a lady, I refer to your judgment."[1]

The train of the Queen of Scots at this time consisted of twenty-six persons, besides the wives of some of her men. Among them were the Bishop of Ross, the indefatigable John Leslie, one of Mary's staunchest and most useful friends; and Lord Herries, whom Nicholas Throckmorton described as "the cunning horseleech, and the wisest of the whole faction;" known among his countrymen as "the most cautious man of his nation;" but of whom his mistress said, "There is nobody can be sure of him."[2] Besides these may be named Lord Livingstone and his wife, Lord Fleming and his wife, and Mr. Hamilton, Master of the Household. There was Willie Douglas, the boy who had been instrumental in aiding the Queen's escape from Loch Leven, and John Beaton, the Cardinal's nephew, who two years afterwards died at Chats-

[1] *Wright*, v. 1, p. 280-81. [2] *Wright*, 1, 276.

worth, and was buried in the neighbouring church of Edensor, where a brass to his memory still remains. There were also Bastian Pagez and his wife, at whose marriage the Queen danced on the night of Darnley's murder; Mary Seaton, Mary Bruce, and some others. The whole party, however, were held in small account by Knollys, who says—

"Now, here are six waiting women, although none of reputation, but Mistress Mary Seaton, who is praised by this Queen to be the finest busker, that is to say, the finest dresser of a woman's head of hair, that is to be seen in any country; whereof we have seen diverse experiences, since her coming hither. And among other pretty devices, yesterday and this day, she did set such a curled hair upon the Queen that it was like to be a perewig that showed very delicately; and every other day she hath a new device of head dressing, without any cost, and yet setteth forth a woman gaily well."[1]

Such matters, however, were but the bye-play of statecraft, in which the two Queens were thus early competing. Mary was avowing most honourable intentions and appealing to every motive likely to influence Elizabeth in her favour; while Elizabeth, who had been profuse enough of offers of service so long as there seemed no prospect of rendering any, was now striving to find decent excuses for not carrying them out. The Queen of Scots, secure within the walls of Loch Leven Castle, and the Queen of Scots a fugitive in England, were two very different persons, and Elizabeth fully recognised the significance of the change. She hesitated and equivocated. It may be that as a kinswoman and a sister Queen she wished

[1] Knollys to Cecil, June 28.—*Chalmers*, v. 1, p. 285.

to show kindness; but as a Sovereign whom Parliament had once bastardised, she could not ignore Mary's pretension to the English crown, and the support her claims were likely to receive from the discontented Catholics. Elizabeth's deliberate judgment told her that Mary must be a prisoner: her weakness made her hesitate to call her one. She dreaded her escape, yet refrained from giving orders for her secure detention, and left the unfortunate custodians in doubt and perplexity.

"They had charge," said Knollys, "not to let her escape, but had no authority to detain her as a prisoner," and he begged her Majesty's "plain resolution."[1] Failing, however, to obtain definite orders, the keepers resolved to look well to their guest, and, without harshness, or much appearance of restraint, guard effectually against surprise.

In a letter, dated June 15th, Knollys thus describes the pastimes of the Queen:—

"Yesterday her grace went out at a postern to walk on Playing green, towards Scotland, and we, with twenty-two halberdeers of Master Reed's band, with divers gentlemen and other servants waited upon her; where about twenty of her retinue played at football before her the space of two hours, very strongly, nimbly, and skilfully, without any foul play offered, the smallness of their ball occasioning their fair play. And before yesterday, since our coming, she went but twice out of the town, once to the like play of football, in the same place, and once she rode out a hunting the hare, she galloping so fast upon every occasion, and her whole retinue being so well horsed, that we, upon experience thereof, doubting that upon a set course some of her friends out of Scotland might invade and assault us upon the sudden, for to rescue and take

[1] Knollys to the Council, June 11.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. 1., No. 18.

her from us, we mean hereafter, if any such riding pastimes be required that way, so much to fear the endangering of her person by some sudden invasion of her enemies, that she must hold us excused in that behalf."[1]

Restraint was irritating to the Queen of Scots, and procrastination only augmented the troubles of the English Council. It was, therefore, resolved to remove the captive further into the kingdom, so as to diminish her means of communication, and render less formidable her threats to delegate her authority to the Duke of Chatelherault, and aid him with such money as she could command, and with the power of her French relations.[2] She spoke of seeking aid from France and Spain, pointed to the history of her reign in Scotland as practical evidence of her power of making troubles, and added that those who detained should have much ado with her.[3]

Lord Scrope was urging Mary to remove to Bolton Castle, his seat in North Yorkshire, and she was interposing obstacles and delays, when on the 7th July, in the course of one of their numerous animated conversations, the Queen of Scots said, "I can sell my right, and there be those that will buy it, and peradventure it hath been in hand already."[4]

At length the patience of the Queen of England's representatives was exhausted, and they insisted on immediate removal. This was effected as quietly as possible, and the royal captive reached Bolton on

[1] Knollys to Cecil.—*Chalmers*, v. 1, p. 288 note.
[2] Knollys to Cecil, 13th June.—*Wright*, v. 1, p. 282.
[3] Knollys to Cecil, 21st June.—*Wright*, v. 1, p. 286.
[4] Knollys to Cecil, 7th July.—*Wright*, v. 1, p. 288.

Thursday, the 15th July, "one hour after sun setting."[1] After leaving Carlisle she was "very quiet, very tractable, and void of displeasant countenance," though she threatened to resist further removal into the realm.[2]

Speaking of Bolton Castle, in the same letter, Knollys says:—

"This house appeareth to be very strong, very fair, and very stately, after the old manner of building, and it is the highest walled house that I have seen, and hath but one entrance thereinto. And half the number of these soldiers may better watch and ward the same, than the whole number thereof could do Carlisle Castle, where Mr. Reade and his soldiers, and Mr. Morton and Mr. Wilford took great pains, and my Lord Scrope also was a late watcher."

During the residence of the Queen of Scots at Bolton was played that strange judicial farce known as the Conference of York. Ostensibly, its object was to compel the Earl of Murray, and his colleagues in the government of Scotland, to answer for their conduct in deposing the Queen; but its real purpose was to supply Elizabeth with a much needed pretext for Mary's continued detention. The interest of the enquiry centred about the question of Mary's complicity in Darnley's murder, and there for the first time were produced the famous casket letters, upon the question of whose genuineness so much in this controversy turns. Around the York conference, and all its circumstances, the Marian champions have fought with the Marian assailants.

[1] The expense of the journey was somewhat heavy, as it was found needful to hire four little carrs, twenty carriage horses, and twenty-three saddle horses for her women and men, but still all was accomplished to her commodity and satisfaction.—Knollys to Cecil, 16 July, 1568.—*Wright*, 1, 291.

[2] Knollys to Cecil.—*Wright*, 1, 289.

Every inch of ground has been hotly contested, and yet nothing has been settled. The latest contributors to the discussion are as much opposed to each other as the earliest. Mr. Froude and Mr. Hosack are as wide apart as George Buchanan and the Bishop of Ross. If Mary had been guilty of the murder of her husband, and of all the flagrant immoralities laid to her charge, even Elizabeth, with all her faith in the divine right of kings, could scarcely have challenged the justness of her deposition.

The Earl of Murray, in dealing with the letters said to have been found in a silver casket, after the flight of the Earl of Bothwell and the incarceration of the Queen, showed much jealous care. He was willing enough to produce copies, but the originals were only exhibited privately to the Commissioners at York, and again to the Privy Council in London. They are now believed to be no longer in existence, so that criticism is at fault; and so little do we really know of their appearance, that it is even a matter of debate in what language they were written. It is clear they made but little impression on the Commissioners, for the Duke of Norfolk, who was President, became a suitor for the hand of the Queen of Scots, and the Earl of Sussex utterly distrusted the Scotch factions, and thought them more likely to purge their Queen from all slanders than to proceed to extremity. He deemed her accusers subtle and inconstant, caring neither for mother nor son, but only to serve their own turns, and if the question of the letters were pushed to decision, he says:—"She will deny them and

accuse most of them of manifest consent to the murder, hardly to be denied; so as upon trial on both sides, her proofs will judicially fall best out as it is thought." And further on he adds: "I think surely no end can be made good for England except the person of the Scotch Queen be detained by one means or other."[1]

There were three parties to the controversy: Elizabeth, who had obtained possession of a dangerous rival, and wished to keep her; the Queen of Scots, very anxious to regain her position; and lastly, Murray and his adherents, who were ruling Scotland and desired to continue to do so. Upon the first and last of these parties devolved the practical shaping of events. Mary was for the time helpless and completely at their mercy; and selfish interests were the only motives either the Scots or the English obeyed. A compromise was most likely to answer the aims of both, but each wanted a compromise of a different kind. It was important for Murray so to leave his sister that she might be "purged" and restored, if such a course proved convenient; while Elizabeth's aim was to keep her rival under a cloud of suspicion, sufficient to afford a pretext for her detention. Without dwelling on the arguments adduced, we may conclude that the guilt of Darnley's murder was fairly divided between Mary and the Scottish Lords; in what they contrived, she

[1] Sussex to Cecil, 22 October, 1568.—*Lodge*, v. 2, pp. 1-6. Mr. Hosack, who, perhaps more than any modern writer, has carefully analysed the evidence relating to these casket letters, concludes:—"The first two are forgeries * * the last three are genuine letters addressed to Darnley, although they may have been in parts interpolated by her enemies."—*Hosack's* "Mary Queen of Scots and her Accusers," p. 228.

acquiesced, and both were too deeply compromised to play with success the part of innocence. In dealing with rivals thus embarrassed by a common guilt, Elizabeth had little difficulty in attaining her ends. So Mary commenced her long captivity, and years of bitter uncertainty, neither excluded from the English succession, nor declared heir to the throne. It is with the personal vicissitudes of the first fifteen years of this detention, as well as with the intricacies and perplexities of the Queen of Scots' political position, that the following pages have to do.

CHAPTER II.

AT the opening of the year 1569, it had become abundantly clear that no satisfactory decision would be reached by conferences either at York or at Westminster. The English ministers had resolved to hold securely their troublesome prisoner, but at the same time to treat her with the consideration and respect due to her rank. To this end, Mary was confided to the care of a nobleman of the highest position and influence, George Talbot, sixth Earl of Shrewsbury, who owned vast estates in the northern and midland counties, and was, among his own people, a virtual sovereign. He was the eldest son of Francis, the fifth in descent from the great John Talbot, who won the earldom; and he succeeded his father in the second year of Elizabeth's reign, having previously taken part in some of the military enterprises of the day. By his first wife, Gertrude, daughter of Thomas Manners, first Earl of Rutland, he had a numerous family, who gave him much trouble; but it was his connection with three of the most remarkable women of the age that conferred historic fame on this Earl of Shrewsbury. Elizabeth his Queen, Mary his prisoner, and Elizabeth Hardwick his second wife, each in their different spheres, rendered his life bitter, and left him in old age a melancholy misanthrope.

John Talbot, the founder of the house of Shrewsbury, is called the "great earl;" Gilbert, the seventh wearer of the coronet, has been named by the populace of Sheffield the "great and glorious earl," chiefly because of his foolishly prodigal expenditure. Following the suggestion of epithets, we have little difficulty in calling the custodian of the Queen of Scots "the unhappy earl," for between his wife and his queens he seems to have been kept in perpetual discomfort.

Look at his portrait, painted in 1580, which still hangs in the Duke of Devonshire's gallery at Hardwick. The countenance conveys the impression of mingled melancholy and cunning. The lines of care have destroyed the smoothness of Shrewsbury's brow, and furrowed his cheeks. The wrinkles about his mouth are partly hidden by a light moustache. His cheeks are hollow, his mouth small and compressed, and the lower part of his face is concealed behind a long silky beard, descending below his ruff. His hair, cut close at the sides of his head, is thin on the crown, except a small tuft over the forehead, which is parted in the middle. Of his figure we have no representation, but it is probable he was rather under middle stature, square set and robust.[1] Speaking of him, Lodge, in his "Illustrations of British History," says:—

"In perpetual danger from the suspicions of one princess, and

[1] His son Gilbert, whose remains were seen in the Shrewsbury vault, at Sheffield, when an examination was made in 1858 in connection with Earl Talbot's claim to the Shrewsbury peerage, was a small man. Careful explorations were made in the vault at the time, but no trace of interments earlier than that of Gilbert were found, although it is known that the fourth, fifth, and sixth Earls were buried there, besides four Countesses, and other members of the family.

G.Talbot Earl of Shrewsbury



the hatred of another; devoted to a service which it is to be hoped his heart did not approve; vexed by the jealousy and rapacity of an unreasonable wife, and by the excesses and quarrels of his sons, from whom he was obliged to withdraw that authoritative attention, the whole of which was required by his charge; we shall view this nobleman through the long space of fifteen years, relinquishing that splendour of public situation, and those blandishments of domestic life, which his exalted rank and vast wealth might have commanded, to become an instrument to the worst of tyrants for the execution of the worst of tyrannies. Be it remembered, however, in apology for him, that he lived in a time when obedience to the will of the monarch was considered as the crown of public virtue—when man, always the creature of prejudice, instead of disturbing the repose of society with his theory of natural liberty, erred with equal absurdity, but less danger, in the practice of unconditional submission."[1]

Queen Elizabeth displayed her usual sagacity in selecting Shrewsbury for the difficult task of keeping the Queen of Scots. His possessions lay in the heart of England, and his chief seat, at Sheffield, was away from the great high-roads of the kingdom. The Earl had seven mansions, and the Countess, his wife, possessed two others in her own right. There was his Castle at Sheffield, with the Manor House two miles away in Sheffield Park; the Manors of Worksop and Wingfield, the Abbey of Rufford, the Hall at Buxton, and the Castle of Tutbury, held on lease from the Crown. The Countess of Shrewsbury had acquired Chatsworth, through her marriage with Sir William Cavendish, and, besides this, she possessed her paternal residence at Hardwick. Amidst these houses, none of them removed very far from each other, and with the country around almost ex-

[1] *Lodge*, v. 1, p. xv.

clusively under Shrewsbury's influence, it was easy to find secure dwellings for the Queen of Scots, without the complete monotony of living in a single house.

As a personage intimately concerned in this great undertaking, the Countess of Shrewsbury was scarcely, if at all, less important than the Earl. She was his second wife; he was her fourth husband. Elizabeth Hardwick, daughter of John Hardwick, of Hardwick, near Chesterfield, will ever stand in the page of history as a remarkable woman. Born in 1520 in the ranks of the lesser gentry, she raised herself by four marriages, into the highest rank of the nobility, and some of the wealthiest and greatest of our titled houses are now proud to trace her blood in their veins.[1] At the early age of twelve, before her own unequalled powers of match-making had developed themselves, Elizabeth Hardwick was married to Robert Barlow, of Barlow, near Dronfield, a gentleman of her own rank, possessing a good property. He died in 1533, leaving his estates to his youthful widow, who waited some years before again entering the matrimonial market. Her second husband was Sir William Cavendish, a gentleman sprung from a good stock in Suffolk, who had acquired a large estate during the great changes of property which followed the dissolution of the Monasteries. The marriage took place in 1547, at Bradgate, near Leicester, a seat of the

[1] See sheet pedigree in R. White's "Worksop and the Dukeries," from which it appears that the present Dukes of Norfolk, Devonshire, Portland and Newcastle, the Earls of Carlisle and Scarboro', as well as other noble and gentle houses, find in her a common ancestor.

Elizabeth Countefs of Shrewſbury.

The Original in the Cavendiſh Family.

Her Seal & Autograph from the Original in the Poſſeſſion of

John Thane

Marquis of Dorset, where his daughter, Lady Jane Grey, was born and nurtured under the tuition of Roger Askham, before those sad days of parental ambition, which led her first to the crown, and then to the scaffold. This union resulted in the birth of both sons and daughters; and the advancement in life of these children became the great object of their mother. Sir William Cavendish died on the 25th October, 1557, and, soon afterwards, his widow married Sir William St. Loe, a knight of large possessions. Such was the influence she acquired over this gentleman, that he left her all his estates, to the exclusion of his daughters by a former marriage, and on his death the experienced, and now wealthy widow, determined to adorn her riches with rank. In an evil hour for his comfort, the Earl of Shrewsbury felt the spell of her charms, and made proposals of marriage; but even his exalted position was not enough to disarm the lady's prudence. A right reverend author, quoted by Lodge, says: "She brought him to terms of the greatest honour and advantage to herself and her children; for he not only yielded to a considerable jointure, but to a union of the families."[1]

Shrewsbury's eldest son was already married to a daughter of the Earl of Pembroke, but the expectant Countess insisted, as preliminary to her own nuptials, that his second son, Gilbert, a youth of tender years, should marry Mary Cavendish, a child not quite twelve years old; and Henry Cavendish, eldest son of Elizabeth Hardwick, was married to

[1] *Lodge*, v. 1, p. xvij.

Lady Grace Talbot, one of the Earl's daughters. These two unions took place on the 9th February, 1568; and, shortly afterwards, Shrewsbury led to the altar one who ranks with the Queen of Scots as the torment of his existence. The new Countess was none of your dainty beauties, but a shrewd, determined, hard-featured woman. Like her greater namesake, Queen Bess, she possessed a masculine mind, guided by feminine adroitness. She was strong to command and to act, but knew when to use the arts of persuasion to gain a point not otherwise attainable. She had a keen insight into character, which she used sometimes to the discomfiture of her husband, sometimes of his prisoner, and always to the subjugation of her dependents. Her hair was of a reddish auburn tint, agreeing with a florid complexion. Her features were regular, her eyes small, her nose was thin and pointed, her mouth firmly compressed, and her face as a whole had an expression too keen to win affection, but well calculated to command submission. Well might Lodge say of her:—

"She was a woman of a masculine understanding and conduct; proud, furious, selfish, and unfeeling. She was a builder, a buyer and seller of estates, a money-lender, a farmer, a merchant of lead, coals, and timber. When disengaged from these employments, she intrigued alternately with Elizabeth and Mary, always to the prejudice and terror of her husband. She lived to a great old age, continually flattered, but seldom deceived, and died in 1607, immensely rich, and without a friend."[1]

Mr. Hunter says:—

"It is certain she was a woman of much address, had a mind admirably fitted for business, very ambitious, and withal

[1] *Lodge*, v. 1, p. xvij.

overbearing, selfish, proud, treacherous, and unfeeling. One object she pursued through a long life—to amass wealth and to aggrandise her family. To this she seems to have sacrificed every principle of honour or affection, and to have completely succeeded."[1]

Into the hands of these two famous personages Mary Stuart passed in January, 1569. The first idea of the arrangement seems to have suggested itself to Queen Elizabeth very soon after Mary's arrival in England, for we find M. de la Forest, the French Ambassador, writing from London on the 19th June, while Mary was still at Carlisle, that they were preparing her quarters "at a Castle named Tutbury, which is only one hundred miles from here, and is a very beautiful place, as they say, especially for hunting, in which, whenever it takes place, the Earl of Shrewsbury, who has a portion of his estate in that neighbourhood, is ordered to give her his company, along with other Lords and gentlemen thereabout."[2]

Again, in October, we find Queen Elizabeth talking with a Mr. Wingfield about Shrewsbury and his new Countess, and expressing, in very flattering terms, her estimate of the lady. She also enquired particularly when Lord Shrewsbury was likely to be at Court, and left on the mind of Mr. Wingfield the impression that the Earl and Countess had no friend living that could have greater consideration for them, or show more love and affection. Queen Elizabeth's affection was not bestowed without a purpose, and when Shrewsbury came to Court he

[1] *Hunter's* "Hallamshire," p. 84, *Gatty's Edition.*
[2] *Teulet's* "Relations Politiques," v. 2, p. 376.

found what that purpose was. Writing to his wife, in November, he tells her that he had had a conversation with the Queen, in the garden, where he found her "at good leisure," and she told him "that ere it were long he should well perceive she did trust him as she did few." He adds, "She would not tell me wherein, but doubt it is about the custody of the Scotch Queen." On the 13th December all doubts were cleared up, and in a postscript to a letter of that date he says:—"Now it is certain the Scotch Queen comes to Tutbury, to my charge; in what order I cannot aserten you." [1]

[1] *Hunter's* "Hallamshire," *Gatty's Edition*, p. 85.

A paper is extant in the handwriting of Shrewsbury, in which he has noted down some of the points on which he desired instruction and guidance. It is headed "Remembrances for my L. of Shrewesbery," and continues as follows:

1. First, to desire to know how long the Q. of Scots shall remain at Sheffield, and whether he may take her to Tutbury as soon as the castle is ready.
2. The parts about Sheffield are still much corrupted with Popery. If she could escape the guard and watch about the house, she might pass over the Moor without any town into Scotland.
3. To desire a letter to Mr. Henry Knolles, that he may remain with "me," (i.e. the Earl of Shrewsbury,) as he knows the Q.'s order and demeanour.
4. To desire the Queen's pleasure as to those who shall keep watch.
5. For my wife's access unto her, if she send for her.
6. Touching removing of her Majesties' stuff.
7. Touching authority and for order of watches in the towns needful.

—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 24.

The answers to Shrewsbury's questions were in the main conveyed in the following document, which is partly abstracted and partly quoted:—

"A memoriall of certen thinges imparted by the Q. Matie. to the erle of Shrewsbery, for the causes following. Gyven at Hampton Courte, the xxvjth day of January, 1568, the xjth year of her Mates. reign."

The Q. has chosen him in consequence of his approved loyalty and faithfulness, and the ancient state and blood from which he is descended, to have the charge and custody of the Q. of Scots.

The Earl is to treat her, being a Queen, of the Q. Eliz's. blood, with the reverence and honour meet for a person of his state and calling and for her degree. He must ask Lord Scrope and the Vice Chamberlain [Knollys] about the ceremonies used by them towards her, that "she may not find herself to be in the usage of herself abased, *nor by this removing to have her state amended*."

Whatever honour he gives her, he must take care that by no pretence she finds any means to gain any rule over him *to practise for her escape*. She must have no opportunity either to escape, *nor yet to practise with any one to help her to*

Long before the date of this communication, Sir Francis Knollys had become very tired of his post. On the 29th September he expressed to Cecil his

escape. He doubtless knows how important it is to the Queen's honour and reputation and quietness that Mary does not depart without the Q.'s assent.

No persons must have conference with her except those already placed about her as her ordinary servants, and those who have special licence from the Queen. The latter for no longer time than is mentioned in the licence.

If any persons coming to visit the Earl or any one in his household, proffer to come to her presence, *or to have conference with any belonging to her*, or if she invites them *to come to her presence in the house or abroad under colour of hunting, or other pastime*, he shall warn them to forbear, and if needful use his authority to make them desist, and send their names to the Q.

Persons coming out of Scotland to see her, if of degrees above that of servants, or if noted to be "busy men and practisers," must be remitted to the Q. for licence. If they are mean servants or persons coming only to have relief of her, he shall not be so strait towards them as to give her occasion to say she is kept a prisoner, *and yet he must understand their errands and not suffer them to abide where she shall be, or to hover about the country*.

He must make a view of all her ordinary servants, *when he first takes the charge, and cause a household roll to be made* of those necessary and of those who were with her at Bolton. With the advice of the Vice Chamberlain he must reduce the number, *omitting those who are superfluous and who are fit rather for practises than service*. When settled, no change is to be made without necessary cause. Her diet must be kept at the former rate, and payments made by the clerk who was sent for that purpose from the Queen's household. He must consult the Vice Chamberlain as to the watching of the house, as he knows her condition and the disposition of those about her. The Q. intended her first to be placed at Tutbury Castle, but as the house is not fit, if she is nearer the Earl's house of Sheffield than Tutbury, she shall remain there till further orders. If she is at Tutbury, it is left to the Earl's discretion to allow her to remain, or to remove her to Sheffield or any other of the Earl's houses.

Because it is thought that she will try to make the Earl think her cause worthy of favour, and that she is not well used in being restrained from liberty, the Q. has ordered, that beside the knowledge which the Earl has of the presumptions produced against her for the murder of her husband, and her unlawful marriage with the principal murderer Bothwell, he shall also be informed of other particulars too long to write here, that he may answer her and her favourers. He may say, as of himself, that if she is known to utter any speeches touching the Q.'s honour or doings, it may be an occasion to publish all her actions, which once being done cannot be revoked, but many things must follow to her prejudice.

He may show her that the cause of her removal from Bolton was partly from lack of things by reason of her long abode, and partly because of her oversight in writing to Scotland things altogether untrue and slanderous, for redress whereof, in abating falsehood and maintaining truth, the Q. has caused to be published on the borders what is known here, and has purposely passed over any accusation of her as the author of these untruths. He can impart to her his knowledge about this, and the Queen's proclamation.

The Q. of S. may see the Countess, if she is sick, or for any other necessary cause, but rarely. No other gentlewoman must be allowed access to her. Generally she must have no conference except with those of the Earl's ordinary. As soon as convenient he must discharge Capt. Reade and his band, who will then return to Berwick. The Earl will then be allowed wages for 40 persons at 6d. a day, to be used at his discretion.

Draft, corrected by Cecil. The last three paragraphs and the passages in italic are in Cecil's handwriting.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 23.

disappointment that he was not discharged.[1] In November he was growing impatient; in December he begs that he may be relieved;[2] in January, the wish "to be rid of her" was the desire of his heart.[3] On the 19th January he wrote to Cecil, saying if he could not be discharged after conducting the Queen of Scots to Tutbury, he would "as sure as God is in heaven, repair to court, and suffer any punishment that may be laid upon him, rather than continue in such employment."[4] To add to his troubles, Knollys's wife died just in the crisis of Mary's removal from Bolton, when the royal prisoner was protesting that she would not go without violence, and all kinds of difficulties were raised about the provision of suitable furniture for Tutbury. From the distraction of his great loss, Knollys had to rouse himself to carry out Elizabeth's orders. The Queen affected consideration for her royal sister in this change of residence, and wrote to Mary on the 20th January, from Hampton Court, that, understanding her dislike to stay at Bolton, she had prepared another place more honourable and convenient, to which Knollys and Lord Scrope would conduct her.[5]

[1] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. I., No. 65. [2] Do. v. II., No. 73.

[3] Do. v. III., No. 14. [4] Do. v. III., No. 16.

[5] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 18. In a memoir taken by M. de la Croix along with letters of La Mothe, the French ambassador, dated London, 10th January, 1569, we read:—"The care of the Queen of Scots has been committed to the Earl of Shrewsbury, to whom they have given a commission in writing, in which it is enjoined on him not to allow her too much liberty, which he did not at first wish to accept; but at length he has been persuaded to take it by the advice of some of the great personages of this kingdom, who have also advised him to treat the said Lady with the honour, respect, and consideration which are fitting for such a princess, notwithstanding his commission to the contrary: and thus it appears that very soon she will be conducted to Tutbury Castle, where preparations have been made for her; and M. de la Mothe had heard that the said Earl of Shrewsbury was a Catholic, but that was his

A change of residence for the Queen of Scots was very unlike the removal of an ordinary prisoner, in the extent and carefulness of the preparations. The magnates of the county were summoned to render assistance; the yeomen to provide conveyance. Yorkshire was then strongly inclined to the old religion, and many of the gentry sympathised with the claims of the Catholic Queen. Knollys, with his strong Puritan views, was of opinion that a more zealous bishop might do something to abate the evil, for, said he, there has not been a sermon in Richmondshire since the beginning of the reign.[1] In this state of things caution was needful, and Knollys felt the full weight of his responsibility.

Tutbury Castle, in its best days no very magnificent structure, was at this time a place of but indifferent comfort. The Shrewsburys occasionally occupied it as a hunting lodge, but its furniture was scanty, its roof leaky, its walls in many places cracked, the windows ill fitting, and the rooms very draughty. Its position, however, was easily defensible. Standing on an eminence, in the valley of the Dove, just within the borders of Staffordshire, it was surrounded with a high wall, and the only access was by a single gateway. Mary, writing of this place many years afterwards, thus describes it:—

"I am in a walled enclosure, on the top of a hill, exposed to all the winds and inclemencies of heaven. Within the said

late father, who continued in that faith until his death, but since then the present earl has gone over to the new religion, and, for the rest, he is a very unassuming lord."—*Teulet's* La Mothe, v. 1, p. 103. A servant of Shrewsbury's writing to the Countess, from London, xij. January, 1568-9, says "The news is here that my Lord is sworn of the privy council, and the Scottish Queen is on her journey to Tutbury, something against her will, and shall be under my Lord's custody there."—*Talbot Papers*, E 221.

[1] Knollys to Cecil, 29th Sept., 1568.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. 1., No. 65.

enclosure, resembling that of the wood of Vincennes, there is a very old hunting lodge, built of timber and plaster, cracked in all parts, the plaster adhering nowhere to the woodwork, and broken in numberless places; the said lodge distant three fathoms or thereabouts from the wall, and situated so low, that the rampart of earth which is behind the wall is on a level with the highest point of the building, so that the sun can never shine upon it on that side, nor any fresh air come to it; for which reason it is so damp, that you cannot put any piece of furniture in that part without its being in four days completely covered with mould. I leave you to think how this must act upon the human body; and in short, the greater part of it is rather a dungeon for base and abject criminals than a habitation fit for a person of my quality, or even of a much lower. * * * The only apartments that I have for my own person consist—and for the truth of this I can appeal to all those who have been here—of two little miserable rooms, so excessively cold, especially at night, that but for the ramparts and entrenchments of curtains and tapestry which I have had made, it would not be possible for me to stay in them in the day time; and out of those who have sat up with me at night during my illnesses, scarcely one has escaped without fluxion, cold, or some disorder."

Mary goes on to say she has "two paltry holes" in which to retire occasionally, with windows facing the dark surrounding wall, the largest of them not above a fathom-and-a-half square. The garden for exercise is a potato ground, fenced in with dry wood:

"A place, to look at, fitter to keep pigs in than to bear the name of a garden; there is not a sheep pen amidst the fields but makes a better appearance." Then again, "This house having no drains to the privies, is subject to a continual stench; and every Saturday they are obliged to empty them, and the one beneath my windows, from which I receive a perfume not the most agreeable."[1]

[1] *Strickland's* "Letters of Mary Queen of Scots," v. 2, p. 161.

To this not very inviting residence was Queen Mary sent. There was some talk of remaining at Sheffield, and permission to stay there was actually obtained; but Knollys found that Lady Shrewsbury had taken all the hangings to furnish Tutbury, since the goods promised from Court did not arrive in time. Ralph Rowlandson, indeed, took from the Tower of London a number of tapestry hangings, together with other furniture, gold and silver plate, and many household comforts, in addition to the ordinary furniture of the house, and to the supplies sent in by Lord Shrewsbury from his other seats.[1]

The route from Bolton to Tutbury was planned with considerable care, and Sir Thomas Gargrave, of Wakefield, a noted Yorkshireman of those days, was instructed to assist Knollys in performing the journey. From Bolton to Ripon was sixteen miles, and at Ripon there was choice of three gentlemen's houses at which to pass the night: Sir William Mallery's, one mile from the town; Richard Norton's, two miles away; or Simon Musgrave's, in the town. The train of attendants was to lie in Ripon. From Ripon to Weatherby was ten miles, and the Queen

[1] A sheet of paper, mostly in the handwriting of Knollys, remains in the Public Record Office, as follows:—"A note of utensyles for the Q. of Skotts at Tudberye."

Kitchen Plate. 10 silver platters, 10 silver dishes, 12 silver saucers.

Cupboard Plate. 2 silver flagons, 2 silver cups, 1 silver bowl, 1 silver bason and ewer.

Chamber Hangings. "Chambers hanged for herself only, the great chamber, her bed chamber, and the chamber between both for her grooms." 3. My Lady Leviston's and Mistress Ceaton's chambers. 2.

Bedding. The Queen's bedchamber. 2 beds. Her grooms' chamber. 2 beds. Lady Leviston's chamber. 2 beds for her and her maids. Mistress Ceaton's chamber. 2 beds for her and her maid.

Also the Mr. Stabler's wife the Master Cook's wife, the Clerk of the Kitchen's wife, and Bastian's wife lie here in the house; but if warned beforehand that they can have no lodging at Tutbury, they will perhaps return to Scotland.

The two physicians and the master of the household also lie within the house here.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 33.

was to lodge with John Vavassor, Esq., whose house was three miles from Weatherby, while the servants took up their quarters in that quiet Yorkshire market town. Thence the journey was to be continued to Pontefract; thence to Rotherham. At the latter place both the Queen and her train were to lie in the town, and, as no gentleman's house is mentioned, we are left to conjecture how they were accommodated. It is possible they may have slept at an inn, but, more probably, lodgings were provided in the College founded by Archbishop Rotherham, at that time the most commodious building in the town. The route thus sketched out was arranged by the Earl of Sussex, Lord President of the North; but his knowledge of the country was not minute beyond the confines of Yorkshire. He says:—

"The best way after ye pass Yorkshire, wherewith I have no dealing, is as I am informed to Chesterfield, near to which Mr. Godfrey Fullgham hath a house, and from thence to Wingfield, where my Lord Shrewsbury hath a house, or to some place thereabouts, and so to Tutbury."[1]

Thus all arrangements were complete. On the 25th January, Mary pleaded for delay because of the bad weather and her own state of health; but her request was unheeded, and when the morning of the 26th dawned cold and grey at Bolton, there was great bustle of final preparations. Within the court yard stood the horses for the Queen and her attendants, and country carts for the conveyance of bag and baggage. The resources of Lord Scrope and

[1] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 17.

his tenants, had been unequal to the task of mounting so large a retinue, and Knollys was compelled to make up the tale, by borrowing from the princely Bishop of Durham. This prelate lent ten horses and two keepers. From other sources six horses, with women's saddles had been borrowed, and sixteen horses for the use of the guard. "The hired horses for the Queen's servants," says Knollys, "are thirty-six, and there are six carts for baggage and eight carriage horses." The royal lady was unwilling to set out, but after some delay yielded to the polite firmness of her guardians, and despite the "foule, long, and cumbersome" way, reached the city of Ripon late in the evening.[1]

Many gentlemen of those parts, either from sympathy or curiosity, were anxious to pay their respects to the captive Queen, but their attentions were declined, for the Earl of Sussex had strongly advised Knollys to admit no unauthorised persons to her Grace's presence. But Sir Robert Melville, an envoy from the Earl of Murray, was granted an audience. He assured his royal mistress of the Regent's regret for the past, and of his earnest desire to see a marriage contracted between his sister and the Duke of Norfolk, a matter which had been privately discussed during the Conference at York, but dropped, when the Scots proceeded to extremities, by the production of the casket letters. Now, however, Murray and Norfolk were again turning their thoughts in the direction of this marriage.

[1] *Labanoff*, v. 2, p. 284. H. Knollys to Cecil, Jan. 21. Sussex to Cecil, Jan. 28. F. Knollys to the Privy Council, Jan. 29.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III.

They had talked it over at a private interview in the park at Hampton Court, and the result of their conference was the message sent to Mary by the mouth of Melville.[1]

One night was passed at Ripon, and next day the Queen travelled to Weatherby, again reaching her destination late in the evening, and showing herself no better pleased than before with the prospects of her comfortless journey. On the 28th, the cavalcade passed from Weatherby to Pontefract, the Queen looking very sad, as a servant of the Earl of Sussex informed him.

"What her meaning is, God knoweth," says Sussex in a letter to Cecil, dated York, January 28th, "but," he continues, "surely when I consider the present accidents in Scotland by the report of the Earl of Murray, how near she lay to Scotland, and how unwilling she was to be further off, I cannot but think it was full time to make her a nearer guest, and that there was some secret intent to do that which I trust shall now never have open effect, wherein if ill be meant it will come upon the devisers."[2]

On reaching Pontefract on the evening of the 28th January, both Knollys and his captive took up their pens, the Vice-Chamberlain to write to the Privy Council, and the Queen to Secretary Cecil. Knollys acknowledges the receipt of instructions to stay on his journey at Sheffield, but pleads that it will make unreadiness for the removal to Tutbury, for to keep all the hired and borrowed horses would be very expensive, and to send them away would leave the cavalcade without means of transport. However,

[1] *Hosack*, pp. 471-475, where there is an able exposure of Murray's treachery and Norfolk's vanity and weakness.

[2] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 30.

he would discharge them, trusting to the ability of the Earl of Shrewsbury to provide what might be needed in his own country.

"I find myself," continued Knollys, "much disquited with this melancholy service in these strange countries, which melancholy humour groweth daily upon me since my wife's death; and I am commanded expressly of God that I shall not tempt my Lord my God, wherefore my continuance in this service is intolerable unless I should obey man rather than God." [1]

Mary Stuart's letter is in a different strain, and refers at length to proclamations and letters which she was accused of writing, but the authenticity of which she utterly denied.[2]

The next stage in the journey was at the old town of Rotherham, standing near the confluence of the Don and the Rother. It had been an important market town for many centuries, having risen in early Saxon times, out of the ruins, and near the site of a Roman station, the name of which has never been satisfactorily established. Rotherham possessed first a Saxon church, then a Norman one, and at the beginning of the 16th century, Thomas de Rotherham, Archbishop of York, founded there a college, for the advancement of learning, and, as is probable, enlarged and adorned the church, of which the Rotherham people are still very proud. The college was suppressed in the reign of King Edward VI. by the commissioners appointed to deal with Chantries, Colleges, and Guilds. Its income at that time amounted to £58. 5s. 9d. The college building was

[1] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 31. [2] *Labanoff*, v. 2, p. 292.

of brick, with stone quoins, and the grounds were enclosed within a lofty wall of similar material. This edifice was standing in 1591, though in a neglected and partly ruinous condition, and belonged to the Earl of Shrewsbury; and here, as we have ventured to suggest, the Queen and her train may have lain.

They arrived in Rotherham on the evening of Saturday, the 29th January, and remained till Monday morning, January 31st. Here, on the Sunday, the Queen wrote a letter, in Scotch, to the Archbishop of St. Andrews, thanking him for his faithful services, and saying that she was on her way to Tutbury, where she expected not to be able to write to her faithful subjects so much as she desired to do.[1]

What else the Queen did, how she occupied her time during the two nights of her stay in Rotherham, we do not know: nor has tradition told us any thing of the thoughts and feelings of the good people of Rotherham on the occasion of this royal visit.[2] The Queen was sick at heart, and weary with her journey. The pain in her side, probably proceeding from an indurated liver, from which Mary suffered for many years, had already begun to trouble her, and her faithful friend and attendant, Lady Livingstone, here became so ill as to be unable to continue the journey.

It had been designed, as we have already said, to make a stay, perhaps of some duration, at Sheffield, but Knollys, on reaching Rotherham, received a

[1] *Labanoff*, v. 2, p.294.

[2] 1568[9] Item. paid to Mr. Lete for whacheing of ye Quene of Skots, 4s. Item. paid to Mr. Bayley for wacheng of ye Quene of Skottes, 2s. 5d.—*Guest's*, "Historic Notices of Rotherham," p. 384; among Notes from the Accounts of the Feoffees of the Common Lands of Rotherham.

messenger from Lord Shrewsbury with the intelligence that my Lady, his wife, had taken all the hangings to Tutbury. The Countess herself sent word that she had furnished Tutbury as well as she could with her own stuff. She had provided, in the Queen's bed chamber, one pallet for her Majesty, and in an adjoining room two pallets for the grooms. Lady Livingstone and her husband were accommodated with two beds, and Mistress Seaton and her maid had two also, in chambers furnished with hangings. In the chambers unprovided with these luxuries, provision was made for John Leviston's wife, for Bastian's wife, for the Master Cook's wife, for the Physician and for the Controller. The rest must do as well as they could, and no secret was made of the limited accommodation, in order to induce some of the servants to return to Scotland.[1]

In the face of the objections of the Shrewsburys, the halt at Sheffield was abandoned, and the journey towards Tutbury resumed on Monday morning.[2] Lady Livingstone, being quite unfit to mount her horse, was left behind; and though the Queen

[1] Knollys to Cecil, Jan. 29.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 32.

[2] Elizabeth acknowledged the force of the objections raised; and in the following document authorized the Earl of Shrewsbury to carry Mary to Tutbury without further delay:—

The Q. to the Earl of Shrewsbury,

"We grete you well—wher amongst other thynges in our instructions it is conteyned that if the Q. of Scottes shuld come to your howse of Sheffield, in hir jorney to Tutbury, that than she shuld remayn there for a season untill our plesure might be furder knowen, we understandyng from you that for sondry respectes to you not knowen at your departure from us, ther nether is nor can be provisions made for any contynuance at Sheffield, but that the provisions at Tutbury ar in resonable case, we leave it to your liberty and discretion, if she be at Sheffield, to remove hir to Tutbury whan yow shall fynd it mete. Gyven under our Signett."

Draft by Cecil. Endd. "30 Jan. 1568. Copy of the Q. Maties. l're to therle of Shrewsbery."—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 34.

would gladly have stayed with her and so delayed the whole company, she yielded to the urgency of Knollys. Herself scarcely able to sit her horse, Mary journeyed painfully, complaining of her side, and in the evening, when the cavalcade halted at "Mr. Fulgeham's house besides Chesterfield," she strongly expressed her unwillingness to move further without Lady Livingstone's attendance.[1] Knollys,

[1] A question has arisen as to where this house of Mr. Foljambe's was. Prince Labanoff (vol. 2, p. 295) assumes it to have been somewhere short of Chesterfield, for he says:—"The 1st February, the Queen of Scots was so much indisposed during her journey from Rotherham to Chesterfield, where she was to pass the night, that she was not able to reach that place, and was obliged to stop on the way at a house belonging to Mr. Foljans." To my mind the evidence does not bear out the conclusion. It was on the 31st January, not on the 1st February, that this part of the journey was made. The chief seat of the Foljambes was then at Walton, about one mile to the south of Chesterfield, but Mr. Hunter, like Prince Labanoff, thinks this was not the place. In a note to his paper "On the claims of Hardwick to have been one of the residences of Mary Queen of Scots during her captivity in England," read before the Society of Antiquaries on the 18th June, 1846, Hunter says:—"This could not have been Walton, near Chesterfield, as might be supposed, that being the chief house of the Foljambes, because Walton is beyond Chesterfield, as the Queen was then travelling. If it did not rather appear that she set out on her journey from Rotherham, the house intended would be Aldwark, one of the seats of the Foljambes, a short distance from Rotherham, but to the north. Junior branches of the family had at that period a house at Barlboro', and also Moorhall, both not far out of what may have been the road on which she travelled; but the precise line is not at present, I apprehend, determinable." I am unable to agree either with Prince Labanoff or with Mr. Hunter. We learn that the Queen rested at Mr. Foljambe's, from a letter of Sir Francis Knollys to Secretary Cecil, in which he says nothing of having stopped short of the intended place of halting. The Earl of Sussex, moreover, in preparing the route, had said, "The best way after ye pass Yorkshire, wherewith I have no dealing, is, as I am informed, to Chesterfield, near to the which Mr. Godfrey Fullgham hath a house." Hence it is clear Foljambe's house was the place intended for the first halt after leaving Rotherham, and going there was not, as Labanoff puts it, a case of stopping unexpectedly on the way. Knollys' description of Foljambe's house shows it to have been the most comfortable residence they had met with since leaving Bolton. The following is a full abstract of Knollys letter to Cecil, taken from the Public Record Office:—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III, No. 35:

Lady Leviston, whom the Queen esteems most dearly, fell sick yesterday at Rotherham, just before the Queen's departure. The Queen did not greatly contend to stay her removing, "yet by the way hitherward the pain and wind of her side did trouble her, and she found her head not well also, and her disease so increased yesternight," that she was unwilling to remove until she could hear whether Lady Leviston was sufficiently recovered to attend on her during her journey. Yielded to her fancy, and offered to her to stay here to-day and to-morrow. Mr. Fulgeham, the gentleman of this house, is a worthy man and dutiful subject, and in all respects the house is fitter to stay in than any they have hitherto found. Were glad by this kind of courtesy to seek to make her more tractable, and to avoid the inconveniences that might have hap-

who preferred to humour rather than contend with his prisoner, whenever compatible with his sense of duty, consented to a day's rest, though he was well aware that these frequent changes of plan involved both inconvenience and heavy loss to the country people, who had to provide the means of transport for baggage. The Queen of Scots therefore spent the nights of Monday and Tuesday under the roof of Mr. Foljambe, and departed on Wednesday, probably for Wingfield Manor, one of the mansions of Lord Shrewsbury. On Thursday, she slept in Derby, and Tutbury was reached on the afternoon of Friday, February 4th.

The arrival of the State prisoner at Tutbury was promptly announced to Secretary Cecil in a joint-letter, from her new and her old guardians, the Earl of Shrewsbury and Sir Francis Knollys. The Queen appeared in good health, as far as Lord Shrewsbury could judge. She was quiet, modest, affable, and received Shrewsbury's introduction without any sign of offence. Knollys, who had been accustomed to her bitter sarcasm and strong invectives, was amazed to see the sharp tongue so bridled. She replied to his remarks temperately, with quiet speech and countenance, and even heard, without objection, of the proposed reduction of her

pened "if she should have feigned herself sick, or if upon displeasure her disease of wind in her side might have grown cumbrously upon her—and yet the alteration of removings is cumbrous to the country."

Mr. Fulgeham's house, beside Chesterfield, 1 Feb., 1568.

There is nothing in this to show that the house is not Walton, but there is much that points strongly to that place. The Foljambes became possessed of the manor of Walton in 1388, by the marriage of Thomas Foljambe, with Margaret, eldest daughter of Sir John Loudham, and it continued to be the capital seat of the family till 1636, when it was sold by Sir Francis Foljambe to Sir Arthur Ingram.

attendants from sixty to thirty. Mary was shown to her apartments, those small rooms of which she afterwards so bitterly complained; and while she and her maids were removing the stains of travel, her keepers exchanged opinions and arranged plans for her future safe custody. Knollys had been instructed to acquaint the Earl of Shrewsbury with all that was requisite for him to know about his charge and her treatment, for it was the intention of the Government that the traditions of the captivity should remain unbroken, and the Queen of Scots find no advantage in her change of keepers. Knollys was directed to impart to the Earl the manner, order, and charges of the diet of the Queen and her company, and to hand over to him any money he might have in hand. The latter item was perhaps added to the instructions in delicate irony, for, of all commodities, money was the one which Elizabeth dealt out most sparingly; and Knollys, so far from having any balance to dispose of, had not sufficient to defray his own travelling expenses to London.[1]

Shrewsbury's first request to Cecil was for the prompt payment of £500, for needful service and provisions for the Queen of Scots' household; and

[1] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 40.—La Mothe, the French Ambassador, writing to the King on the 15th Feb., 1569, says:—"The Queen of Scots has been conducted to Tutbury, where, in consequence of representations I have made to the Queen of England, I hope she will not receive worse treatment than she had at Bolton; [the Queen] having, since my last audience, granted leave to the Bishop of Ross and Lord Herries, and to her other commissioners who were here, to go and see her, with permission for her to keep attached to her person such among them, or others of her servants and advisers, as she may please, on reporting to her their names; and that the others may be at liberty to go away, if they choose, into Scotland; and it is believed that the Earl of Shrewsbury, who has the charge of her, will treat her with all honour and respect, and use toward her all the courtesy and gentleness that he can, and that she will be quite safe from personal danger in his hands."—*Teulet's* "La Mothe," i. 195.

it was not the last time, by a great many, that he had that request to prefer. All through the long term of his guardianship, the want of money remained a standing ground of complaint. The allowance made to him was £52 per week, a sum which Shrewsbury declared did not pay for victuals alone, and even this was most capriciously and irregularly paid.

Another point in the instructions, and one on which Knollys feared there might be a scene with the Queen of Scots, was the direction "to help to discharge such superfluous Scots and Frenchmen as do no other service but practise unmete things." Courteously but firmly this order was communicated to Mary, and to the surprise of Knollys she showed herself contented. But it was a show of contentment only, for ever and again she complained of the removal of attendants necessary to her service.[1]

[1] From a document in the Public Record Office (*Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 41), signed by the Earl of Shrewsbury, we have the names of the suit permitted to remain. It reads as follows:—

"The Names of the Scotes Men.

Chief Men.—10. Belton, master of household; Leveston, master of the horse; Bortyque, of the pantry; 'Lerde of Gartleye'; Crawfort, the carver; Mr Magarnie, 'medesiner'; Peter Rolat, secretary; Mr Arnold Collomnius, surgeon; Gary Formew, comptroller; Alexander Boge.

Varlets of the Chamber.—Bastien; Balthaser Hulls; Gylbert Curle; Ange Marye; Will. Douglas; Florans Girarde.

Usher of the Chamber.—Arche Beton.

The Warderobe.—Robart Mackinson; John Cristles.

Tailor.—Jacques Seuller.

'*Tapisser.*'—Florens Broshere.

Pantry.—William the Sumlyer; Gwyon Lossellewr.

Sumler.—Didye Chistard; Gillya Royde.

Kitchen.—Astyan Hana, master cook; Martyne Hewyt; Pearse Medard.

Pastry.—John de Bona, pastler; Glawd Gaulona, baker.

The Lord Leveston, two gentlemen, two lackies, one page—6.

(Sum—thirty persons, whereunto one more is permitted unto the Lord Leveston.)

Stable.—2 pages; 3 lackies; 3 horse-keepers; the farrier; 10 horses. These are provided for in the town till the Queen's pleasure be known.—[Note by Cecil: '2 horse-keepers, 1 farrier.']

While Mary was settling the arrangements in her new abode, she received from Elizabeth an answer to some of her letters, if answer that can be called, which tells the complaining captive she has no ground of complaint.[1] Mary replied at length on the 10th February, and on the next day wrote to Secretary Cecil to the following effect:—

"Has more willingly believed the good report made by her commissioners of his honourable deportment to her, than the advertisements she has received to the contrary. In answer to his request to name the authors of certain letters which offended him, of which copies are sent to her, she would be

Servants.—Mrs. Ceton; 1 man; 'Mr. Howsholde; Mr. Stabler'; the physician; secretary Rolet; the surgeon; the comptroller; Bastyen; the man cook; the pantler; the cellar; the someler; the tailor,—one man each.

One man is permitted to Mrs. Ceton, and one to the physician until the Queen's pleasure is known.

This order is not fully executed, but warning given. They cease not to urge to obtain the whole number. *Signed by Shrewsbury.*

Endd. 'A note of the Q. of Scots servants and horses. Feb. 1568."

[1] Queen Elizabeth's letter (*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 36), is as follows:—

"Queen Elizabeth to Q. of Scotts.

"Madame, we have of late receyved by the handes of the B[ishop] of Rosse two of your lettres, the one writen at Bolton, the other at Rippon. By the which emongst other thinges of your greefes, which yow utter *in the same*, we perceive your departure from Bolton hath not ben *the lest* to your contentation, *which*, for our part (the causes thereof *being* well considered), we see not why you shoulde disallow thereof. For your satisfaction *wherein* we have sufficiently communicated our reasons to the said B. of Rosse, *assuring our selves also that you shall fynd good cause to be contented with the honourable usage that yow shall fynd in our coosyn the Erle of Shrewsbury, and in the meane tyme we* wishe yow to quyet yourself in all things, *accordying to the pryncely good hart that God hath gyven you, with this* assurance, that if there be no impedymentes mynistred to us by your self, or *by* such of yours as you do avow (*in whom some oversight* of late hath ben seene *to our grief*), we will take that care of your causes, as in honour we shall alwayes answer to your trust reposid in us. Wherof at this instant we did give sufficient occasion openly before our counsell to your *commissionars*, the B. of Rosse, and the Lord Herrys, for them to have taken hold of some good opportunitie to have done you good. But how it happeneth we know not, they pretending to lack commission and authorite, seeme rather desyrous to retourne to their contreys with an opynion that yow will use some others towards us, *or els retorn some of them with authorite furder to treatte.* Wherby we *ar* stayd *in our* intention and at theyr earnest request have lycencid them to depart unto you as persons whom we cannot choose but commende for their *paynefull* travelles *and dutyfull dealying with us at all tymes* for you."

Draft—the passages in italic are corrections in Cecil's hand.

glad to inform him if she did not fear injuring certain individuals. If she could speak with him, she doubts not that he would be satisfied. Will tell him again, what she has already written, that all that she has heard has come from Scotland. Has never before seen a duplicate which was shown her, and did not give the form of the proclamations, and does not know what they contain. The Bishop of Ross tells her 'que vous mettrez ces choses soubz le pied,' which she begs him to do, and she will do the like. She asks for the continuance of his good will. Her commissioners have reported to her that the Queen told them that she believed that Mary had here the same liberty and treatment as at 'Bowton;' that she was allowed thirty persons, and others to go and come freely on her affairs. It seems by what she hears from the Earl of Shrewsbury that her liberty will be retrenched, and that she will not be allowed to send to the Queen, nor to France, nor Scotland; nor to receive letters without express commission from the Queen, in which much time will be consumed, and often the opportunity would be lost, for providing for her most urgent affairs. She asks him to obtain leave for the Earl of Shrewsbury to give passports to her people, as Knollys has done hitherto, and also for Lord Scrope to continue as before. The Earl tells her that he cannot allow her commissioners to stay more than one day in passing with her, without the Queen's express orders. He has granted leave for two of them to reside near her, and she wishes them to be the Bishop of Ross and Lord Boyd. She asks that lodgings in the Castle for themselves and two servants may be granted, as there is no accommodation in the village. The bearer, Bothwik, will tell Cecil about the stable, to which she wishes attention paid.

Tutbury. 11th Feb. 1569. 'Votre bien bonne amye Marie R."[1]

Thus by complaint, explanation, and remonstrance, Mary endeavoured to secure some mitigation of her position. Outwardly she remained calm

[1] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, III., No. 47.—"*French*, *pp.* 2. Signed. *Add Endd.* This letter is not published in Prince Labanoff's *Recueil.*

and quiet, and spoke with her host only on common and indifferent subjects. Towards Queen Elizabeth her words were mild and seemly, but the captive never for a moment disarmed the watchfulness of the shrewd men who then guided the destinies of England. They knew the mischief of which she was capable, and narrowly watched both herself and her emissaries. The Bishop of Ross, her zealous and most trusty ambassador, was an object of especial suspicion; and when, failing to secure lodgings in the Castle at Tutbury, he removed with Lord Boyd to the neighbouring town of Burton-on-Trent, Shrewsbury felt it needful to place a watch on his proceedings, and ascertain the names of the persons with whom he consorted. In consequence of this surveillance, one Thomas Bishop, who in the reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. had been employed in subordinate capacities in connection with Scotch affairs, was arrested and sent to London for examination by the Council. A long account of his confession remains in the Record Office, but Bishop had not been entrusted with any dangerous secrets; and though it may have been true, as Shrewsbury said, that he was no other than "a lewd practising Scot, and a naughty person," his confession did not seriously implicate either Queen Mary or her agents.[1]

But though Bishop revealed nothing, there had been, even at this early stage of the captivity, sundry communings with the Spanish Ambassador, and appeals for aid from his royal master. The

[1] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., Nos. 58 and 60.

plots, however, were far from ripe. Many stages of intrigue had yet to be gone through; for though Philip expressed much compassion for his suffering cousin, and felt much bitterness against his Protestant sister-in-law, his zeal for abstract justice was not without discretion, and he thought it better to see what the Duke of Alva could make of Elizabeth, before taking a decided part for Mary Stuart.[1] If Philip could gain his ends without her aid, Mary Stuart might languish; if she seemed likely to prove a useful weapon in his hands, he was not unwilling to take up her cause. Such seems to have been the extent of the King of Spain's tender regard for the Queen of Scots.

Mary was now fairly established in her quarters at Tutbury, and we may try to picture to ourselves her mode of life. She was a prisoner, in so far as she was confined to a single residence, and debarred from free intercourse with strangers; but, within the limits of the Castle, she kept a mimic Court.[2] At the head of her room was a dais, overhung with a cloth of estate. Her attendants, though reduced, were still numerous, and, at this time, her religious convictions were so far respected, that Sir John Moretown, a priest, was one of her household. Her cuisine was delicately served. She ate off services of silver. Her hands were washed in a silver gilt bowl. Her bed was sheeted with fine linen, and

[1] *Teulet's* "Relations Politique," v. 5, p. 48.

[2] The Queen of Scots, in a letter to the French Ambassador, dated March 15th, 1569, says:—"I am strictly guarded, as the bearer of this letter will tell you, and all messengers whom they suppose to have letters to me or from me are arrested and searched. Nevertheless, if I have a cypher with you, I will not hesitate to adventure something and write to you as may be necessary, and you also on your part I suppose will do."—*Teulet's* "La Mothe," v. 1, p. 286.

hung with tapestry. Turkey carpets lay on her floors, though carpets were then a luxury. Her rooms were lighted at night with candles that stood in gilt "Chaundellours." Her chairs were covered with crimson and cloth of gold, and her maids of honour sat on embroidered stools. In her stable stood ten good horses, but this number was soon reduced to six; her grooms were three, and her farrier one; for it was Lord Shrewsbury's desire that the Queen should be engaged as much as possible in out-door recreations, to give her the less leisure for mischievous plotting.

About this time Nicholas White, second son of Sir James White, of Waterford, a member of the Irish Council, paid a visit to Tutbury while on his way to Ireland, and though his letter to Sir William Cecil, describing the visit, has been often quoted, either wholly or in part, its graphic details must be our excuse for reproducing it. The letter is dated West Chester, 26th February, and is as follows:—

"Sir, when I came to Colsell, a town in Chester way, I understood that Tutbury Castell was not above half a day's journey out of my way. Finding the wind contrary, and having somewhat to say to my Lord Shrewsbury touching the county of Wexford, I took post-horses and came thither about five of the clock in the evening, where I was very friendly received by the earl.

"The Queen of Scots, understanding by his lordship, that a servant of the queen's majesty of some credit was come to the house, seemed desirous to speak with me, and thereupon came forth of her privy chamber into the presence chamber where I was, and in very courteous manner bade me welcome, and asked of me 'how her good sister did.' I told her grace 'that the queen's majesty (God be praised) did very well,

saving that all her felicities gave place to some natural passions of grief, which she conceived for the death of her kinswoman and good servant the Lady Knollys, and how by that occasion her highness fell for a while, from a prince wanting nothing in this world, to private mourning, in which solitary estate, being forgetful of her own health, she took cold, wherewith she was much troubled, and whereof she was well delivered.'

"This much past, she heard the English service with a book of the psalms in English in her hand, which she showed me after. When service was done, her grace fell in talk with me of sundry matters, from six to seven of the clock, beginning first to excuse her ill English, declaring herself more willing than apt to learn that language; how she used translations as a means to attain it; and that Mr. Vice-Chamberlain was her good schoolmaster. From this she returned back again to talk of my Lady Knollys. And after many speeches past to and fro of that gentlewoman, I, perceiving her to harp much upon her departure, said, that the long absence of her husband (and specially in that article), together with the fervency of her fever, did greatly further her end, wanting nothing else that either art or man's help could devise for her recovery, lying in a prince's court, near her person, where every hour her careful ear understood of her estate, and where also she was very often visited by her majesty's own comfortable presence; and said merely that, although her grace (Mary) were not culpable of this accident, yet she was the cause without which their being asunder had not happened.' She said 'she was very sorry for her death, because she had hoped well to have been acquainted with her.' 'I perceive by my Lord of Shrewsbury,' said she, 'that ye go into Ireland, which is a troublesome country, to serve my sister there.' 'I do so, madame; and the chiefest trouble of Ireland proceeds from the north of Scotland, through the Earl of Argyle's supportation.' Whereunto she little answered.

"I asked her how she liked her change of air. She said 'if it might have pleased her good sister to let her remain where she was, she would not have removed for change of air this time of the year; but she was the better contented therewith,

because she was come so much the nearer to her good sister, whom she desired to see above all things, if it might please her to grant the same.' I told her grace 'that although she had not the actual, yet she had always the effectual presence of the queen's majesty (Elizabeth) by her great bounty and kindness, who, in the opinion of us abroad in the world, did ever perform towards her the office of a gracious prince, a natural kinswoman, a loving sister, and a faithful friend; and how much she had to thank God that, after the passing of so many perils, she was safely arrived into such a realm, as where all we of the common sort deemed she had good cause, through the goodness of the queen's majesty, to think herself rather princelike entertained, than hardly restrained of any thing that was fit for her grace's estate; and for my own part did wish her grace meekly to bow her mind to God, who hath put her into this school to learn to know him to be above kings and princes of this world;' with such other like speeches as time and occasion then served, which she very gently accepted, and confessed 'that indeed she had great cause to thank God for sparing of her, and great cause likewise to thank her good sister for this kindly using of her. As for contentation in this her present estate, she would not require it at God's hands, but only patience, which she humbly prayed him to give her.'

"I asked her grace, since the weather did cut off all exercises abroad, how she passed the time within. She said that all the day she wrought with her needle, and that the diversity of the colours made the work seem less tedious, and continued so long at it till very pain did make her to give it over; and with that laid her hand upon her left side and complained of an old grief newly increased there. Upon this occasion she entered into a pretty disputable comparison between carving, painting, and working with the needle, affirming painting in her own opinion for the most commendable quality. I answered her grace, I could skill of neither of them, but that I have read *Pictura* to be *veritas falsa*. With this she closed up her talk, and bidding me farewell, retired into her privy chamber.

"She said nothing directly of yourself to me. Nevertheless,

I have found that, which at my first entrance into her presence chamber I imagined, which was, that her servant Bethun (Beaton), had given her some privy note of me; for, as soon as he espied me, he forsook our acquaintance at court, and repaired straight into her privy chamber, and from that forth we could never see him. But after supper, Mr. Harry Knollys and I fell into close conference, and he, among other things, told me how loth the queen was to leave Bolton Castle, not sparing to give forth in speech that the secretary [Cecil] was her enemy, and that she mistrusted by this removing he would cause her to be made away; and that her danger was so much the more because there was one, dwelling very near Tutbury, which pretended title in succession to the crown of England, meaning the Earl of Huntingdon. But when her passion was past, as he told me, she said 'that though the secretary was not her friend, yet she must say that he was an expert wise man, a maintainer of all good laws for the government of this realm, and a faithful servant to his mistress, wishing it might be her luck to get the friendship of so wise a man.'

"Sir, I durst take upon my death to justify what manner of man Sir William Cecil is, but I know not whence this opinion proceeds. The living God preserve her life long, whom you serve in singleness of heart, and make all her desired successors to become her predecessors.

"But if I, which in the sight of God bear the queen's majesty (Elizabeth) a natural love beside my bounden duty, might give advice, there should be very few subjects in this land have access to or conference with this lady. For, beside that she is a goodly personage, and yet in truth not comparable to our sovereign, she hath withal an alluring grace, a pretty Scottish accent, and a searching wit, clouded with mildness. Fame might move some to relieve her, and glory joined to gain might stir others to adventure much for her sake. Then joy is a lively infective sense, and carrieth many persuasions to the heart, which ruleth all the rest. Mine own affection by seeing the queen's majesty our sovereign is doubled, and thereby I guess what sight might work in others. Her hair of itself is black, and yet Mr. Knollys told me that she wears hair of sundry colours.

"In looking upon her cloth of estate (canopy), I noted this sentence embroidered, *En ma fin est mon commencement*, which is a riddle I understand not. The greatest personage in house about her is the Lord of Levenston and the lady his wife, which is a fair gentlewoman, and it was told me *both Protestants*. She hath nine women more, fifty persons in household, with ten horses. The Bishop of Ross lay then three miles off in a town called Burton-upon-Trent, with another Scottish lord, whose name I have forgotten. My Lord of Shrewsbury is very careful of his charge, but the queen over-watches them all, for it is one of the clock at least every night ere she go to bed.

"The next morning I was up timely, and, viewing the site of the house, which in mine opinion stands much like Windsor, I espied two halberd men without the castle wall searching underneath the queen's bed-chamber window.

"Thus have I troubled your honour with rehearsal of this long colloquy which happened between the queen of Scots and me, and yet had I rather, in my own fancy, adventure thus to encumber you, than leave it unreported, as near as my memory could serve me, though the greatest part of our communication was in the presence of my Lord of Shrewsbury and Mr. Harry Knollys; praying you to bear with me therein, among the number of those that load you with long frivolous letters. And so I humbly take my leave, awaiting an easterly wind. From West Chester, the 26th of February.

"Your honour's assuredly to command,

"N. WHITE."[1]

Only half a year before the date of this letter White had fallen into some disgrace, and seems at this time to have been sent to Ireland as much to make proof of his loyalty, as to take advantage of his experience. He was successful in regaining the confidence of the Court, for little more than a year later—viz.: 27th May, 1570—Cecil calls him "My good Nicholas White," and says, "I do continue,

[1] *Strickland*, v. 2, pp. 379—384.

and will not desist to love heartily the honest virtues, which I am persuaded are settled and rooted in you, for the which I love you and so will, except you make the change." [1]

White's interview with the Queen of Scots did not escape criticism at Court, and on the 24th March, we find Shrewsbury explaining that Mr. White's talk with the Queen was not long, that he heard the whole of it, and understood it as matter of no moment. Still he removed all occasions that might induce further speech or acquaintance between them. Shrewsbury further assures Cecil that he will take care the Queen is surely kept in all respects, without either increase of acquaintance or allowing any persons, contrary to the Queen's pleasure.[2]

The account Lord Shrewsbury gives of his captive's occupations, entirely agrees with that of Nicholas White. In a letter to Cecil, dated the 13th March, he says:—

"This Queen continueth daily resort unto my wife's chamber, where with the Lady Leviston and Mrs. Seaton, she useth to sit working with the needle, in which she much delighteth, and in devising of works; and her talk is altogether of indifferent and trifling matters without ministering any sign of secret dealing and practice."

Such occupations and discourse the Earl very naturally assumed to be not only harmless, but helpful to her safe custody; still, if Elizabeth were not satisfied, he expressed himself willing to use more restraint. Then passing to the subject of Mary's ailment, Shrewsbury says:—

[1] *Wright*, v. 1, 364.

[2] Shrewsbury to Cecil, 24th March.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 66.

"She hath complained almost this fortnight of her grief of the spleen, which my physician Leverett informeth me (being here to minister unto me), as he understands by her physician, is *obstructio splenis cum flatu hypondriaco* (*sic.*), wherewith oft times, by reason of great pains through windy matter ascending unto her head and other parts, she is ready to swoon. On Thursday last she received pills devised by her own physician, whereof she was very sick that night, but after the working amended. She wanteth, as she saith, things necessary touching medicine for her in such needful cases, wherein nevertheless I mind not to deal without her Majesty's pleasure known. Troubled she is, as appears sometimes, with the remembrance of the Earl of Murray, on whom then she uttereth some melancholic affection." [1]

It was the necessity of guarding, while not appearing to restrain, that gave the Earl of Shrewsbury so much trouble and anxiety. Had his prisoner been immured, he could have felt at ease for her safety; but she was a prisoner in fact, and a queen in appearance, and the combination proved most perplexing to her keeper. What was the best course to adopt Shrewsbury could not decide, and, in his anxiety, he made himself a prisoner, as much as the Queen. His plan was to keep his charge almost constantly in view, and, as he says, at the close of the letter from which we have just quoted, for his own satisfaction and to prevent conference and increase of acquaintance, he has not been absent from his charge half a day since her coming to Tutbury. In another letter he thanks Cecil for his defence and good interpretation of the Queen's resort to his wife's chamber, and says he cannot avoid it without keeping fast the doors, or denying it with such resistance that Mary

[1] Shrewsbury to Cecil, 13 March.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 62.

would consider herself used as a strait prisoner, a step which he is willing to take, unpleasant though it might be, if the Queen wishes. No one, he imagines, can think that he or his wife are glad of this tedious attendance, almost hourly, with want of their own liberties. Indeed he can neither hear nor speak anything without fear and suspicion. The only advantage of Mary's resort to Lady Shrewsbury's chamber is that the more he and his wife have her in sight the more are they assured of her safe keeping.[1]

Thus soon had the unfortunate nobleman begun to tire of the irksome charge, and he says, if it were not for the humble zeal and duty which he and his wife bear to their Queen, they would have made most humble means to be relieved from their doubtful and careful burden. Still he comforts himself with the thought that his Queen trusts him, and that, in the romantic language of the day, was reward enough.[2] Still Elizabeth was not satisfied, and further stringent orders against the access of strangers were issued.[3]

The sense of her helpless position sometimes roused the Queen of Scots to anger, and at others tempted her to despair. Usually, she masked her emotions, but sometimes her passion broke forth into invectives and culminated in tears. To Elizabeth she was almost as outspoken as to her ministers, and

[1] Shrewsbury to Cecil.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 70.

[2] In a letter, dated 17th April, Shrewsbury declares that since Henry Knollys left, few hours have passed when the Queen of Scots has not been in his sight or hearing.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 71.

[3] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 12.

some of her remonstrances read more like the reproaches of one who supposed she had suffered the worst, than the intercessions of a prisoner begging for freedom.

While the transactions, to which we have just referred, were going on, Mary addressed one of her stormy letters to the Queen, complaining of the detention of her servants on the border, and of the opening of her letters; treatment very different from that which had been promised, and which, if persisted in, would compel her to appeal for aid to foreign powers.[1]

Elizabeth replied on the 31st March, with unruffled composure, imparting the cruel intelligence that the Duke of Chatelherault and others of Mary's party had submitted to her son, and given formal approval of the deposition and imprisonment of their Queen.[2]

The Queen of Scots would fain have persuaded herself this statement was not true. Shrewsbury reported her disquietude, manifested both by words and tears. She declined to accept English testimony to such unwelcome facts, and asked permission to send one of her servants to Edinburgh to report the real state of the case.[3] This was granted, and Sandy Bog started on the journey. Meantime Elizabeth, ever curious about the movements of the captive, enquired how Mary digested the news she had sent her;[4] and replying to this question on the

[1] Mary to Elizabeth, March 13— *Labanoff*, v. 2, p. 306.
[2] Elizabeth to Mary.—*Strickland*, v. 1, p. 159.
[3] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 70.
[4] Cecil to Shrewsbury.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 11.

17th April, nine days after his previous communication, Lord Shrewsbury said:—

"The Queen of Scots seems to have digested indifferently the last advertisement of the Scotch proceedings, for she has uttered no passions or trouble of mind since he last wrote. All that appears are a few words now and then of the good hope she is in that her friends will in no wise agree against her. She is expecting Sandy Bog her messenger to return in two or three days, and will then send the Bishop of Ross to the Queen." [1]

On the 15th April, Mary had been comforting herself with the idea that the Duke of Chatelherault, whom she had so often spoken of as her "whole delight and trust," and in whose favour she had drawn up an instrument assigning her authority till her return to Scotland,[2] was "half out of his senses."[3] To Elizabeth she turns with her favourite threat to seek foreign aid, saying, "you must not impute it to a failure of good nature, if, not being provided with assistance by my nearest relation, I accept that succour from one more distant and less agreeable."[4]

All these perplexities and anxieties told seriously upon the health of the Queen of Scots. We have seen how her strength failed, and the pain in her side increased, on her journey towards Tutbury, and we quoted above Shrewsbury's testimony, written on the 13th March. On the 15th of the same month, Mary said in a letter to M. de la Mothe, the French Ambassador, carried by the hand of Borthwick, her servant "I am strictly guarded, as the bearer of this will tell you, and all messengers whom they

[1] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 71. [2] *Wright*, v. I, p. 293.
[3] *Strickland*, v. I, p. 161. [4] *Strickland*, v. I, p. 164.

suppose to have letters for me or from me are arrested or searched." [1]

Bertrand de Salignac de la Mothe Fénélon, whose name we shall often have occasion to mention in these pages, succeeded Bochetel de la Forest as Ambassador in England from the court of France, in November, 1568. M. Teulet, the Editor of his dispatches, says, "Of all the ambassadors of France in England none took more to heart the interest of Mary Stuart, and none occupied themselves about her concerns with more zeal and loyalty." [2] References to the Queen of Scots are constantly recurring in La Mothe's despatches, and Mary was perpetually pouring her complaints into his sympathising ear. On the 20th September, 1575, when Michel de Castelnau de Mauvissière became the representative of France, Mary felt the departure of La Mothe as a personal loss. But, as so often happens, the privation proved less in reality than in anticipation, and for ten years Mary accorded to M. de Castelnau her full confidence.

[1] *Teulet's* "La Mothe," v. 1, p. 286.

[2] *Teulet's* "Relations Politiques," v. 2, p. 392, Note.

CHAPTER III.

TUTBURY Castle, as we have seen, was not a very desirable residence; and in addition to the drawbacks incident to an old and dilapidated building, there were difficulties about provisions and fuel which pressed with some severity on the Earl of Shrewsbury. He had not been settled in Tutbury, with his charge, many weeks, before he sought permission to remove to one of his other mansions, and on the 14th March, he received an authority to take the Queen of Scots to Wingfield, in Derbyshire.

Wingfield Manor was, along with Sheffield and Worksop, a favourite residence of the Shrewsburys. Leland, who wrote in the time of Henry VIII., says, "Winfeld, or Wenfeld, in Derbyshire, is but a manor place, but it far passeth Sheffield Castle." The mansion and estate came into the possession of John second Earl of Shrewsbury, in the reign of Henry VI. He had purchased, of Ralph Lord Cromwell, the reversion of the property, and entered into possession on the death of that nobleman, in 1455.

The mansion had been partially built by Lord Cromwell, and was added to, but, perhaps, not completed by Earl John. This nobleman lived in unquiet times, when the Wars of the Roses were distracting England, and on his death, at the battle

of Northampton, on the 10th July, 1460, he had only enjoyed the Earldom seven years. Still it is clear, from the Steward's accounts, that building works were executed at Wingfield in his time. John, the third Earl, died in 1473, at the early age of 25; but his son and successor, George, the fourth Earl, reigned, if we may so phrase it, for 70 years, and died at Wingfield in 1541. It is scarcely assuming too much, to attribute some of the most striking features of the manor house, as it stood in the reign of Elizabeth, to this nobleman. What John left unfinished George completed, and the mansion was, at the time of which we write, a house suitable in magnificence to be a chief seat of so splendid a family as the Talbots.

Standing at the end of a promontory that falls abruptly on the north, east, and west sides, Wingfield was a place of some natural strength, but by no means impregnable. The buildings of the mansion formed two courts, an inner and an outer one; the first lying to the south and the other to the north. The entrance to the outer court was on the east side by an arched gateway, to the left of which stands the castle barn, and to the right, the "barrack," a long barn-like building which probably acquired its present name during the Civil Wars, when Wingfield stood a siege. Around the west and south sides of this court were stables, outbuildings and servants' quarters; and from the west there may, perhaps, have been a postern or sally port. Outside the buildings on the south, the only side where the ground does not fall rapidly from the walls, traces of

earthworks still remain, and the field in which they are retains the name of "the bulwarks."

Between the outward, or south court, and the inward, or north court, there is a second gateway, with porter's lodge, and all the arrangements for careful watching; and round the north quadrangle stood the chief rooms of the mansion.

Opposite the visitor, as he passes through the gateway, stands the porch leading to the great hall and the state apartments. To the westward stands the massive tower of the keep, with dungeon cells in its thick walls; and running from this tower along the west side of the court are the foundations of a range of buildings, in which, according to tradition, were the apartments of the Queen of Scots. Nothing now remains of them but the outer wall and the inner foundations, but some idea of the character of the accommodation may still be formed. The numerous narrow windows, the fireplaces, and the many angles, all point to a series of small rooms; and if there were any larger rooms they must have fronted to the court, a position that made them not only safe from hostile attack, but, in the case of the Queen of Scots, diminished the chances of escape.

On the north side of the court are the chief remains of the mansion. Passing through a porch we reach the great hall, 72 feet 4 inches long by 36 feet 5 inches wide, having a richly decorated bay window, and three flat windows on the south side, and five windows on the north, the mullions and tracery of which have been cut away. The dais stood at the east end of the room, and when the noble owners

sat at their raised table and the crowd of retainers filled the hall, the scene must have been a brilliant and a busy one. Tapestry adorned the walls, as we may judge from the staples that still remain; and over the Earl's chair was emblazoned his coat of arms, with its many quarterings.

To the left of the porch lay the buttery, the buttery hatch, and the kitchens. Of the latter the huge fire places and ovens still remain, to bear convincing testimony to the good cheer in which the household indulged. Reached by a flight of stairs, was the saloon or ball room, lighted by a large decorated window in its south end, and from it were accessible a suite of bed rooms over the buttery and kitchens, extending to the western boundary of the buildings.

Beneath the great hall, and of the same dimensions, was a crypt, which still remains. Two rows of octagon pillars support groined arches massively ribbed. The vaulted roof is filled in with rag stone, and has been covered with plaster, which time has caused to fall away. Small windows in the north side afford scanty light to this rich, but somewhat gloomy apartment. In its east end was a door leading to the garden, while a passage from the west end led direct to the kitchen. About the use of this crypt there has been much controversy, and when we look at the excellence of its finish, and note that it is by no means an underground cellar, we might be tempted to conclude that it was a servants' hall. But remembering the habits of the times, how the Lord and his attendants were wont

to take their meals together, divided only by the salt, we hesitate to accept that theory. Possibly it may have been the chapel, for traces of which archæologists have sought in vain.

The east side of the north court does not appear to have been occupied with buildings, but was protected by a wall. The garden of the mansion lay to the north, divided from the park by a sunk fence and a dry ditch.

In exchanging Tutbury for Wingfield, as a place of abode, Mary unquestionably changed for the better. It was "a fair palace" in which, though guarded, she had the means of making herself comfortable. Her friends came and went with more freedom than at Tutbury, and never was her pen more active than during the six months of her residence here. Indeed, if Mary had carried herself with discretion at this period, it is quite possible some arrangement in her favour might have been made. But discretion was the one thing the Queen of Scots lacked, and no sooner did she find herself enjoying somewhat modified restraint, than she plunged into treasonable correspondence with the Duke of Alva, and poured her love letters on the Duke of Norfolk. She wrote to La Mothe Fénélon, to Cecil, to the Duke of Chatelherault, her near kinsman, and after her son, the heir to the Scottish throne; she wrote to Argyle, to the Bishop of Ross, and to the Lords of the Council; very carefully adapting her communications to the tastes of the receivers. It was here that Leonard Dacre, one of the wildest of men, and a near kinsman of the

Earl of Shrewsbury, plotted her escape; but was dissuaded from carrying it out by the Duke of Norfolk, who feared the prize might slip through his hands and fall into those of the Spaniard. But we are anticipating the course of events.

Shrewsbury obtained permission to remove to Wingfield in March; and early in April that vigorous lady, his Countess, preceded him, to prepare the house. On Wednesday, the 20th, the royal captive arrived at her new abode, after a very quiet journey. Neither gentlemen nor any "of the meaner sort" assembled on the way to meet or to see her. Only Sir George Hastings, who was with the Earl at Tutbury the day before their departure, without seeing the Queen, met the cavalcade and rode with them for a mile, talking to the Earl; but there was no talk between the Queen of Scots and any of them.[1]

Cheered by her change of circumstances, and in great hope of some "notable goodness" from the Queen, Mary communicated freely with those of her partizans who were suffered to approach her person, or to forward letters. The Bishop of Ross, with the strings of all the plots in his hands, had so far succeeded in allaying the suspicions of Elizabeth as to obtain permission to remain near his mistress, and when she removed to Wingfield, rooms were assigned to him in the house. Scotchmen resorted to their Queen in such numbers that Shrewsbury complained. In May, he wrote that they daily increased, and though they lodged

[1] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 72.

in the town, he could not prevent their hourly access to the Queen, without some notable grief and unquietness. Her company, coming and going about her, amounted to eighty persons, or thereabouts, and Shrewsbury's expenses greatly exceeded his allowance, besides the necessity of keeping more men for the safety of his charge.[1]

At the time of Mary's removal to Wingfield she was expecting, with some impatience, the return of Sandy Bog, sent to Scotland to ascertain the truth of the statements about the Duke of Chatelherault and Lord Herries. He should have been back on the 20th April, and his non-arrival troubled the Queen, who feared he had been stopped at the borders, or else that the proceedings in Scotland were not to her desire. The 23d came and went, and still no Sandy Bog appeared. Mary could endure no longer, and on the 24th she resolved to send the Bishop of Ross to Queen Elizabeth with a letter earnestly begging support and aid.[2] Before he started, however, with the first letter, Mary wrote a second, in which she says:—

"I will no longer defer to despatch my counsellor, the Bishop of Ross, present bearer, to supplicate you, that without further waiting the good or evil deportment of my subjects, you will resolve on a direct reply; and according to my long and urgent request, either return me to my realm, or still better, permit me to depart to seek succour from other princes, my allies and friends. For it is now near a year since I first awaited your resolution, during which time my rebels have greatly strengthened themselves. Therefore, I cannot any

[1] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 84.
[2] Mary to Elizabeth.—*Labanoff*, v. 2, p. 326.

longer, by my own consent, brook further delay, without resolving me for what cause, as more at length the Bishop of Ross shall declare to you on my part, to whom I supplicate you to give credit as to myself."[1]

The next day, in the afternoon, Sandy Bog arrived, and was at once conducted to his mistress. After talking with him, she wept and lamented exceedingly till she went to bed, alleging oftentimes that for her own life she made small account, but to see her friends so spoiled and used for her sake, was as grievous as any death could be to her. She marvelled that her good sister would see her thus used, and with other words, to the like effect, she gave vent to her grief. Her lips and face were greatly swollen with weeping; she would eat nothing at supper, but wept as she sat, nothwithstanding all persuasion. The Earl and his wife did what they could, telling her to comfort herself with the Queen's goodness, who was assuredly bent towards her. She heard all they said very quietly, but they could not appease her weeping.[2] Thus she retired to her chamber, and there, burning the midnight oil, poured out her complaints to Elizabeth.

Next morning, Sandy Bog was sent forward to London to give his own account of his sufferings; and on the 28th, Mary wrote again to the Queen, having received further intelligence about the treatment of the Duke of Chatelherault and others, intimating her intention of seeking foreign aid if Elizabeth failed her; and adding:—

[1] *Strickland*, v. 1, p. 171.

[2] Shrewsbury to Cecil, April 27.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 75.

"I have not, therefore, failed to send you this full warning, to the end that you might not hold me in ill will, or take offence at what will follow, assuring you that I will not willingly do any thing to offend or displease you, otherwise than to save my state, and to deliver my oppressed subjects from the injustice of my rebels. I supplicate you, madame, to bind me to you by amity and good offices, rather than by strict guard; my only desire, as the fruit of my labour here, being to render you all the duty and friendship which can be offered by a loved and dear sister."[1]

Meanwhile the Bishop of Ross, and after him Sandy Bog, arrived in London. In a letter to Lord Shrewsbury, dated the 29th of April, Cecil says:—

"The Bishop of Ross came hither four days past, utterly unlooked for, until that Queen had received answer out of Scotland; and now yesterday came Sandy Bog, whereupon the Bishop had large talk with the Queen's majesty yester night."[2]

The Bishop himself reported to his mistress on the second of May, telling her of his arrival in London on Tuesday night, the 26th of April, of his audience with the Queen, whom he found very careful of his mistress's welfare, and nothing content with her subjects who had declined from their obedience. Elizabeth, according to this authority, said Mary's rebels in Scotland were not worthy to live, and, added the Bishop, "I perceive your good sister, and all the nobility here, be more careful of your honour, weal, and advancement, than ever I perceived them before." Having discussed high politics, the Bishop cautiously approached his mistress's personal grievances, and especially the complaint which so filled her mind when he left Wingfield, the detention of Sandy Bog. Elizabeth,

[1] *Strickland*, v. 1, p. 173. [2] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 12.

he said, marvelled that the Earl of Shrewsbury should be so hard, for it was her wish that all servants coming out of Scotland should have access to their Queen, but to make no stay in ordinary, except the number appointed. She promised to cause her Secretary to write to Lord Hunsdon, saying that she is offended at his treatment of Queen Mary's servants upon the borders, and also said she had written to the Earl of Shrewsbury giving leave for the Countess to keep her company whenever she wished.[1]

These reports naturally filled Mary with exultation. She thought her release was at hand, and in the intoxication of her delight carried herself rather indiscreetly. In a letter to M. La Mothe, dated the 7th May, she said: "It seems to me, M. de la Mothe, that if you were at this season to speak a little sharply to the Queen of England, I should be better of."[2] But La Mothe probably understood the situation better than his interesting client, and was aware that ever and anon the old feeling of jealousy and suspicion came over Elizabeth, inducing her to belie her fair words, by charging Shrewsbury to suffer no person, being a stranger, to come into the presence and speech of that Queen.[3]

[1] Bishop of Ross to Queen Mary.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 77.

[2] Mary to La Mothe.—*Strickland.* v. 1., p. 174.

[3] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 12.—In this letter, which is addressed by Sir William Cecil to the Earl of Shrewsbury, the writer says:—"As concerning the resort of Sir John Zouche, for matters of the country, to your L. I do not think but he may repair, and confer with your L. But the Q. majesty hath of late said in the matter wherein she was offended with Semar and Rollston, that she had charged you to suffer no person, being a stranger, to come to the presence and speech of that Queen. Whereupon I said to her majesty that it was hard for you to command men to depart out of your house when they should come to speak with your L., and she said that she had warned your L. thereof, that if any should have cause to speak with you, you might appoint

Doubts were indeed already felt about the propriety of permitting Mary to enjoy so much freedom, and not long afterwards the scheme for her marriage with the Duke of Norfolk, favoured by an influential section of the English Council, alarmed Elizabeth into renewed restraints.

While these negotiations were in progress, Mary was visited by an attack of sickness, that caused some little consternation, both at Wingfield, and in London. Elizabeth and Shrewsbury were fearful lest the suspicion of foul play should attach to them, for the death of the Queen of Scots, at this time, would have been much too opportune to seem a purely natural coincidence. Shrewsbury's account of the attack, which occurred on Tuesday, the 10th May, was written on the 12th. He says:—

"This Queen, on receipt of pills by her physician, for ease of her spleen, became very sick, and sownded divers times vehemently, so as they were driven to give her to drink *aqua vitæ* in good quantity, but after the pills wrought the same night, she escaped the danger. Her body remains yet still very much distempered."[1]

On the day she was seized with this illness Mary wrote nearly identical notes to the Bishop of Ross and to the French Ambassador, describing the attack as similar to the one that so nearly proved fatal to her at Jedburgh, in the autumn of 1566.[2] The in-

some place to confer with them, without permitting them to have the sight or presence of the Queen's majesty. I do report her majesty's very words to your L., to which I answered that I was very well assured that whatsoever your L. took to be her mind you would perform it."

[1] Shrewsbury to Cecil.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 80.

[2] To the Bishop she said:—"Having an opportunity to send to you now, I wish to inform you of my indisposition, fearing you might be anxious after hearing of the state in which I was this morning, which was similar to the attack I had at Jedburgh. I took at 8 o'clock some pills, and was suddenly

telligence naturally reached the ears of the foreign ambassadors in London. La Mothe Fénélon wrote to the King of France:—"The Queen of Scots has been extremely ill, and word was sent to me yesterday evening at vespers that she was dead, but at eleven o'clock at night I had information that on the contrary she was better."[1]

On the other hand, the Spanish Ambassador thought the illness feigned, to move the mind of the Queen of England.[2] Certainly her recovery was as sudden as her attack, for the next day, Mary was able to go to the Earl of Shrewsbury's chamber to complain of the detention of one of her servants, the Laird of Gartly, at Carlisle. She wept as she entered Shrewsbury's room, and during her conference, "divers times shed tears," and "spoke with grief and passion of her servants being thus stayed contrary to the Queen's advertisement to her, but without any unseemly sign or word towards her Majesty."[3]

The same day, Mary wrote to the Duke of Norfolk one of those strange love letters which, though

seized with shivering and vomiting, and fell several times into convulsions, which lasted until 1 p.m., but, thanks be to God, I feel almost myself again, and hope soon to be quite better. If any of my friends have already heard anything of it, you can relieve their anxiety, and I pray God to keep you, Sir, in his holy care."—*Labanoff*, v. 2, p. 342.

[1] *Strickland*, v. 1, p. 174.—In a postscript to a letter dated 23d May, 1569, M. de la Mothe says:—"The Queen of Scots . . . had given charge to the bearer to come and say to me that on the 10th of this month, having at 8 o'clock in the morning taken some pills, suddenly she was seized with a shivering and vomiting, and several times convulsed, and she had remained so until one o'clock in the afternoon, but that she was, thanks be to God, pretty well recovered, and hoped that she might continue better. This Queen has sent physicians to her. I hope to be able, in the name of your majesty, so to assert in the settlement of this lady's affairs as not to injure your own. She has great need of money for her necessary services."—*Teulet's* "La Mothe," v. 1., p. 403.

[2] Don Guerau to Alva.—*Froude*, v. 9, p. 452, note 2.

[3] Shrewsbury to Cecil.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 80.

phrased with affection, sorely lack the reality. We have seen that at Ripon the Queen received intimation of the renewed negotiations for her marriage with the Duke. Murray, to serve his own ends, had professed his willingness to Norfolk to bring about the union, and said, if his sister were once separated from that ungodly and unlawful marriage she had entered into, and were afterward joined with a godly and honourable personage, well affectioned to the true religion, he could find in his heart to love her, and to show her as great pleasure, favour, and goodwill, as ever he did in his life.[1] These were the words of the man who had accused his sister and Queen of murder and adultery, and who while thus encouraging the ambition of Norfolk, was advising Cecil to look well to the custody of the prisoner, saying, he found she was not destitute of friends, and should, therefore, be the more carefully guarded.[2]

Mary eagerly embraced the proposal, as opening a prospect of deliverance, and her letter to the Duke of Norfolk from Wingfield, dated the day after the attack of illness above described, gives assurances of her care to avoid treachery, and of her entire devotion to his cause. The Queen adds:—

"I have not taken very much ease this last night, so that I am not able to write further, and this in pain, being in fever. I pray you, take it not in evil part, for I mind it not, for I thought yesternight to have sent you the token you sent, to pray you not to leave your care of me for any extremity. I send the Bishop of Ross letters from Scotland; do you in

[1] Letter of Murray read at the trial of the Duke of Norfolk, January 14th, 1572.—*State Trials*, v. 1, p. 93.

[2] *Hosack*, 475.

them as you think best; I may write no more. As soon as I be anything amended, I shall write more plainly. I pray God preserve you; and if you send me any news, I pray God they be more comfortable. From my bed, the 11th of May. I shall do what I may to be soon up, and so your answer to my last letters shall fully resolve you daily with letters. My trembling hand here will write no more."[1]

The Earl of Shrewsbury's letter, of the 12th May, was delivered to Secretary Cecil on the 14th, and the next day Cecil replied:—

"May it please your good Lord, yesterday, the Bishop of Ross gave me your lordship's letters containing the recovery of the Queen of Scots health, upon the peril wherein she was by receiving of certain pills. Her Majesty, having knowledge by report of Mr. Cavendish of the said Queen's peril, was very sorry; and so also, glad of her recovery; and indeed it were good her physician were reproved in his audacity to put her in such peril, as I have heard he did the like heretofore."

Mr. Secretary then proceeds to impart to his correspondent some items of news from France, and concludes with the following postscript:—

"The Queen's majesty, whilst I was folding up my letter, hath willed me to notify to your Lordship, how well she alloweth of your preciseness in that you willed Mr. Cavendish not to resort any more thither without warrant from hence; never the less her Majesty findeth cause to allow so well of the gentleman, as she is content that your Lordship may use him as your Lp. is wont to do. Order is given at Carlisle to put to full liberty the Q. of Scots servants; and surely the Deputy Warden doth it of some error, for on my faith I know not of any direction given him therein, and so I pray your Lordp. assure the Q. of Scots."[2]

The Earl of Shrewsbury replied on the 21st May, saying, the Queen receives thankfully the intelli-

[1] *Strickland*, v. 1, p. 213. [2] *Lodge*, v. 2, pp. 13-15.

gence that her servants are to have full liberty to cross the frontiers, she begs Cecil to continue her good friend, and desires the Earl to tell him that she fears, unless the order is given by letters of commandment, her servants will still be stopped at Carlisle ; but he has assured her to the contrary.[1]

The Bishop of Ross, anxious about his mistress's health, notwithstanding her statement that she was almost herself again, asked Cecil to send two physicians to visit her. Elizabeth, now really alarmed, lost no time in sending Mr. Cawdwell and Mr. Francis, who reached Wingfield on Sunday, the 22d of May, and were at once admitted to the presence of the Queen of Scots. To her they declared the cause of their coming, and her Majesty's goodwill and care :—

"She showed herself very thankful, with divers good words, alleging that no physic could be so good unto her as that comfort which she then received from her Majesty her good sister, in this time of adversity, saying further that she now looked for comfort at her hands. She prayed for her Majesty's prosperous long life, and wished to God that her true heart and meaning were known to her, and that it would please him that she might once see her, and testify the same, and therewith appeared her tears."

The visit of these gentlemen was taken advantage of to effect a change in the Queen's lodgings, and secure that thorough cleansing which the rooms seemed so much to need.

"Since the arrival of the physicians, within these two days," says Shrewsbury, "there has grown in the next chamber by her, very unpleasant and fulsome savour, hurtful to her health, by continual pestering and uncleanly order of her own folks."

[1] Shrewsbury to Cecil, 21st May.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 84.

By the Doctor's advice, and with Mary's consent, Shrewsbury removed her in a litter to his wife's house at Chatsworth, where, he says, she will remain five or six days, while her lodging is made sweet, and better order taken for keeping it so. Though the remove will greatly increase his charges and trouble, he thought it was advisable.[1]

This removal to Chatsworth was Mary's first visit to that beautiful seat which the Countess of Shrewsbury held under the will of Sir William Cavendish, her second husband. A new mansion was at that time being erected, but enough was finished for habitation, and thither Mary was taken on the 25th of May. The Chatsworth of those days has given place to the modern mansion proudly called "the Palace of the Peak;" but there remains one curious and interesting relic of the captive Queen, in the form of a raised and moated garden, standing a little distance from the house, where, it is said, Mary resorted for air and exercise. Her present visit was but a short one, for on the 1st of June she was again at Wingfield.

The Earl of Shrewsbury accompanied his charge in both her journeys; but between the 8th and 15th of June, he seems to have paid another visit to Chatsworth, for on the latter date we find him telling Sir William Cecil that he has come from Chatsworth, though in his litter, and found every man's part and duty as well answered as if he had been present himself.[2] The return was evidently

[1] Shrewsbury to Cecil, 25th May.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 88.

[2] Shrewsbury to Cecil, June 15.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 94.—To Queen Elizabeth, Shrewsbury says, writing on the 23rd June, that he re-

made hastily, either in consequence of an admonition from court, or because disquieting reports reached him from his own household. The consequences were, however, to himself very serious. The litter in which Shrewsbury travelled was an open one, and being at the time somewhat of an invalid, he caught cold, was seized with an ague, and though he drank a whole quart of the liquor called metheglen, composed of honey and water, the chill could not be thrown off. Very soon he was in a burning fever, and then "*loquaci delirio laborabit.*" The moment were a critical one, but the Countess of Shrewsbury, who had already buried three husbands, was equal to the occasion, and at once assumed the command. She wrote to Secretary Cecil to inform him of the state of affairs, and ask him "to make provision for this charge, in case any further peril should chance towards" the Earl. She saw signs, however, of his amendment, and undertook, pending instructions, that the former order of watching and warding should be more diligently kept than ever.[1]

The news threw Elizabeth into something very like a panic. Indecision was banished, and before the day closed on which the intelligence reached London, a messenger had been despatched to Sir John Zouche, of Codnor, a friend of the Earl of Shrewsbury's, desiring him to repair to Wingfield, and attend upon the Queen of Scots, during the

moved in the extremity of his sickness from another house eight miles distant, and came to Wingfield at the peril of his life."—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 98.

[1] Countess of Shrewsbury to Cecil, June 19.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 95.

Earl's illness, and to behave towards her so that she might perceive he was a gentleman of good blood and consideration.[1]

Happily this aid was not then needed. Before the orders of the Court reached Derbyshire, the sharpness of the attack was passed. Under the attention of Dr. Francis, who was still at Wingfield, the Earl was well treated, and though seized on the 19th June, he continued from the 20th steadily to amend, and by the end of the week was able to give quite an encouraging account of his state and prospects.

"Indeed," says his Lordship, "I was so grievously tormented with the sharpness of the gout, as I fell into an extreme hot ague thereby, wherewith I was so vexed for the time as I wished heartily rather to die than live, if God has so been pleased, but thanked be his goodness, I have ever since Monday last, through the benefit of nature and some easy medicines recovered every day more than other, so as now I feel myself not only sound in body, but also so eased of my painful feet, as I trust verily within these few days to be more able and apt to travel than I was of long time before."[2]

Lady Shrewsbury also assured the all potent secretary that her husband was in comfortable health and strength, looking to his charge himself in giving orders and commandment; and in reply to some suspicion that seems to have been thrown on her loyalty, she wrote with her own hand:—

"Of my duty in all respects, God, that is my witness of my doings and meaning, will defend me, I trust, against the evil that malice would unto me. No enemy would I willingly refuse to be my judge in this case, that hath power to think and speak truly, but most heartily do I thank you for your right friendly

[1] Elizabeth to Zouche, June 22nd.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 96.

[2] Shrewsbury to Cecil, June 23rd.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 101.

admonition, knowing that I cannot too much remember my duty, like as I would be no less sorry if I were not persuaded that ye did write only of good will, without all cause of suspicion. I have hitherto found you to be my singular good friend, and so I trust you will continue, which God grant I may requite to my desire."[1]

On the 27th of June, Shrewsbury wrote again to Cecil, desiring him to thank the Queen in his name for her most gracious words and opinion, and for sending Dr. Francis, and assuring her that she would find him most willing to serve her with what he had, and with the effusion of his blood.[2] When this was written Shrewsbury seemed to be recovering, but two days afterwards he had a serious relapse, and fell into such a fit of ague that both himself and his attendants doubted of his life. Sir John Zouche was sent for, and attended daily in such a manner that Mary was safely guarded, and the public service suffered no detriment. Cecil, in describing this second attack to Sir John Norris, said :—

"Lord Shrewsbury having been first stricken with a palsy, is now stricken lamentably with a phrensie. It is likely the Queen of Scots shall remove to Belvoir in the charge of my Lord Bedford."[3]

This change, however, was never made, for Lord Shrewsbury soon recovered sufficiently to retain his responsibility. On the 3rd of July, the same day that Cecil was writing to Norris, Shrewsbury was able to say, "I am now amended, and in good hope perfectly to recover within a short time."[4] On the

[1] Countess of Shrewsbury to Cecil, 26th June.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 103.

[2] Shrewsbury to Cecil, June 27.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 105.

[3] *Chalmers*, v. I, p. 329, note.

[4] Shrewsbury to Cecil, July 3rd.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 107.

7th July, being informed that the Queen, hearing of his death, or extreme danger, was sending Sir Francis Knollys and other gentlemen to supply his place, Shrewsbury wrote to say that he had escaped the danger, "as well of my grievous disease, as also of mine extreme ague." He was, he said, as able as ever to give orders and directions. Had neither fit of fever, nor swelling, nor pain of his said disease; and had Sir John Zouche attending according to the Queen's pleasure. He felt his strength and stomach so well to increase that he doubted not his ability to travel abroad in a few days.[1] On the 11th, his health and strength still improved, and he had his stomach, and rest in the night as well as ever he had. That day he attempted to walk in his outer chamber, but he abstains from any further boldness than Dr. Francis will permit, whose precepts he means not to break in the least part.[2]

The good Earl had need of all his caution, for his recovery was neither so complete, nor so rapid, as he had fondly hoped. On the 22nd July we find him still writing of his illness to Cecil, and saying that he was only troubled with the gout in his hands and legs. Otherwise he was recovering, and could walk from his chamber to his gallery adjoining, but he was not so well as to have quite forgotten the lessons of his sickness.

"Having at this time," he says, "felt the mighty hand of God, who hath pleased to restore me to better health than I have lately had, I mind not as yet to walk abroad into the air

[1] Shrewsbury to Cecil, July 7.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 108.

[2] Shrewsbury to Cecil, July 11.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 109.

over boldly, but to tender my health better than I have done in times past."

He was advised, he said, to use the "baynes at Buckstones," when he was stronger, and desired Cecil to move the Queen to grant him license to go thither, without which he may not leave his charge; nor would he wish to do so, but that he hopes by the benefit of the water, which he has known to profit many, that he will be better able to serve God, the Queen, and his country in time to come.[1]

The required permission was not granted, but Shrewsbury, sorely nipped with the gout, went at his peril, without leave from his royal mistress. Such audacity could not be permitted. On the 14th August, Cecil wrote to him:—

"The Queen's majesty, hearing doubtfully of uncertain reports that you should be, or would shortly depart to the baths at Buxton, demandeth of me what I heard thereof from your Lordship; whereunto I could not make any certain answer, but in this sort,—that I knew (as indeed I did by Mr. Bacon, and your secretary), that you were earnestly advised of your physicians to go thither for the recovery of your health; and therefore, I thought if ye were gone thither, necessity compelled you; and yet, I was assured in so doing, you had left a substantial order for attendance upon the Queen of Scots, as should be both honourable and sure. Whereupon I found her majesty some what troubled what to think thereof; and therefore, as in a cause uncertain, she commanded me to send some person expressly with speed to understand the very truth hereof, and therewith to give your Lordship my poor advice, that if you were not departed to Buxton, you would stay that journey until knowledge had from her majesty; and if you were gone

[1] Shrewsbury to Cecil, July 22.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 113.

(which she said she would hardly believe), then I should seek to understand what order your Lordship had left for attendance upon the said Queen, and that yourself should not be long absent from thence; which her majesty said she did as much esteem for her own honour to have the Queen of Scots to be honourably attended, as for any matter of surety. And thus being directed by her majesty's earnest speech with me, I am bold to write to your Lordship in this manner; praying you to take the same according to my good meaning; assuring your Lordship that divers do think it very strange, if it be true, that you have departed to Buxton, without making the Queen's majesty privy thereof, and somewhat the more (if it be true that is also said) that my Lady of Shrewsbury should be also gone thither with your Lordship."[1]

The reports were true enough. The Earl had gone to Buxton, and, in reply to this courteous but sharp rebuke, could only plead in excuse the state of his health, and express a hope that the Queen would not be offended with him.[2]

[1] Cecil to Shrewsbury, 14th August.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 18.

[2] Shrewsbury to Cecil, 18th August.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 2.

CHAPTER IV.

THE health of the Queen of Scots continued to be the subject of much anxiety to her keepers, and that lady was far too shrewd not to improve this advantage, by making the most of every symptom. At the end of June she consulted Dr Francis, "for the old grief of her side."[1] Nearly two months later, namely on the 21st August, she was "still troubled" with the same complaint, and desired to leave Wingfield, which, as Shrewsbury says, "in consequence of the long abode here, and the number of people (more than 240) waxes unsavory." Partly to meet her wishes, but also for his own accommodation, Shrewsbury suggested a removal to Sheffield, where, he said, he had two houses within a mile of each other, so that the Queen could change residence as they grew to be noisome, without troubling the country with further removes. The Earl pressed Cecil for an answer, pleading that his guest was "very anxious to move, feeling sure that it will much benefit her health." "Touching her usage and pastime here," he adds, "she is very well satisfied and pleased."[2]

[1] Shrewsbury to Cecil, June 27.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 105.
[2] Shrewsbury to Cecil, Aug. 21.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 4.

The answer to this appeal was sent as promptly as the impatient Queen could desire. Shrewsbury's letter was written on the 21st August; on the 29th the Earl of Leicester and Secretary Cecil, replying by Queen Elizabeth's orders, say:—

"Upon motion made to the Queen's majesty, by reason of your letters written to me, William Cecil, for licensing of you to remove the Queen of Scots to your Lordship's house at Sheffield, her Majesty hath willed us both to write unto you, that as she was contented therewith, upon such necessity as you had expressed in your letter, so would she have you warned that you should foresee that in the removing of the said Queen there should no open pomp be used, nor assembly of strangers, but to be done circumspectly and quietly. Her majesty also by her words, seemed to be informed that your Lordship and the Lady your wife should permit [permitted] all persons coming to either of you to have resort to the Queen of Scots' presence; whereof, for our own part, we answered that we heard of no such thing, but thought your Lordship did observe such orders as had been prescribed to you by her majesty, and thought also that the Queen of Scots did so much esteem her favour as she would not attempt anything to miscontent her majesty."[1]

To this combined consent and warning, Shrewsbury replied on the 3rd September. He says he will prepare as speedily as possible for the removal of the Queen of Scots to Sheffield, and will avoid any assembly or meeting at her removal; denies that there is any foundation for the reports that had reached the Queen of his allowing general resort to the presence of his prisoner, and says no one can prove it. The gout was again troubling him; he felt pains in his hands and feet, and naively expresses the hope that God will grant to Leicester

[1] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 20.

and Cecil good health, and never to be troubled with any part of that cruel pain.[1]

The change to Sheffield, however, was not then made; but to understand the reasons we must retrace our steps to the month of May, when we left the Bishop of Ross in negotiation with the Queen of England, devising at her commandment certain articles of accommodation. The members of the Privy Council who were favourable to the Scotch succession, were almost as much encouraged by the aspect of affairs at that time as was the Queen of Scots herself. In a spirit of loyalty to Elizabeth they desired to see the succession settled in favour of the Stuart family, and to this end they actively revived the project of Mary's marriage with the Duke of Norfolk. The Bishop of Ross flitted from courtier to courtier. He talked with the Queen, and then with members of the Privy Council. Elizabeth lent a favourable ear to his suggestions, and the Council may well have believed that in furthering the Norfolk marriage they were but anticipating the wishes of their sovereign.

A meeting was held, called by Mr. Froude, "a secret meeting of the Council," but which really possessed no claim to that designation. There were present the Duke of Norfolk, and the Earls of Arundel, Pembroke, and Leicester, and the record of their proceedings exists in the handwriting of the Bishop of Ross's clerk, but endorsed by Cecil "in

[1] Shrewsbury to Leicester and Cecil, Sept, 3.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 9.

June 1569." At this meeting a document was drawn up, entitled "the heads and articles gathered by the Bishop of Ross, of certain conferences had with some of the nobility of England, declared to the Queen of Scotland his sovereign, and to report her answer thereupon in June last, 1569." The proposals were these :—

"1. Whether she would wholly refer herself and her cause to the Queen of England?

"2. Whether she would satisfy and answer the Queen's majesty in all things concerning her title to the crown?

"3. Whether she would cause the same religion professed in England to be established in Scotland by Parliament?

"4. Whether the league between Scotland and France should be dissolved, and an armed perpetual league be made between England and Scotland?

"5. Whether, touching her marriage with the Duke of Norfolk, which had been moved to her by the Earl of Murray and Lidington, she would wholly refer herself to the Queen's majesty, and therein do as she would have her, and as her majesty did like thereof,—willing that all things should be done for her majesty's surety, which might be best advised by the whole council?"[1]

The document was forwarded to Mary at Wingfield, by the Bishop of Ross, and through him the Queen's reply was addressed, "to my lords of the nobility." She answered promptly, writing in the first person.

To the first enquiry, Mary said, she would refer herself and her causes to the Queen; if restored to her crown and authority, her son at her disposition, her honour repaired, and her fortunes rendered to

[1] *Froude*, v. 9, p. 453, but revised by the original *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. III., No. 112.

those whom she will appoint, she will then use clemency towards her subjects, notwithstanding their offences, and will in all other things take the Queen's advice.

To the second question, Mary answered that she would give surety to the Queen concerning her title to the English crown, with the provisions contained in the Bishop of Ross's instructions.

As an answer to the third question, she referred to the Bishop's instructions.

To the fourth, she briefly assented.

To the fifth, and most interesting enquiry, she made the following rather lengthy rejoinder:—

"My fortune has been so evil in the progress of my life, and specially in my marriages, as hardly I can be brought to have any mind to like of an husband, but rather by a simple and solitary life to give testimony by my continent behaviour to all those who might put doubt therein. The troubles passed have so weakened the state of my body, as I cannot think any certainty of my continuance; and thus neither shall I receive thereby, after so many storms, any felicity, nor should I leave him that I should marry in so good estate as he now is. Nevertheless, being resolved of certain doubts which occur to me from the trust I have in the Queen, my good sister, and her nobility's friendship towards me, as also from the goodwill I perceive my Lord of Norfolk bears towards me, hearing him so well reported abroad, I will wholly follow her counsel, not doubting, but as I trust them herein, being in the greatest matter that can appertain to myself, they will have consideration of my causes, as of her that wholly committeth herself into their hands. Though not to boast myself, yet, because they might somewhat the better think of my true meaning to the Queen, my good sister, as also of my good affection to those of the nobility and the realm to which I count not myself a stranger, I assure you that if either men or money to have reduced my rebels to their

due obedience could have ticed me, I would have been provided of a husband ere now. But I, seeking which way to please my good sister, and them here, did never give ear to any such offer. Now this I make account to myself, that if I should marry with my Lord of Norfolk I am sure to lose all my friends beyond the seas, as France and Spain, and all other Catholic princes. This is the greatest loss that I could lose. In recompense whereof if I do by following of her counsel take this hurt, what friendship shall I win in the stead to be sure to me? If I should give my consent to my Lord of Norfolk in this behalf, I would know how my good sister's will and consent may be had to the same. Pray, my lords, to bear with me, though I cast some doubt therein, considering how unwilling I have found her to have me bestowed in marriage before, as I am sure themselves know. I would in this cause have as much consideration of him that should be my husband, as I would have of myself. I would be loath to bring him, who now I know has as much felicity and contentation as any nobleman of his calling can desire, to a worse estate; and, therefore, I would be glad to know not only if my good sister would like thereof, but also how friendly those of the nobility would deal with him, that he might not be with his sovereign, princes, and countrymen, as my late husband the Lord Darnley was, which I to my grief did then find, and I would be sorry to enter into the like whereof I was well warned."[1]

In a despatch to the King of France, dated the 21st June, La Mothe said that already the greatest people in the kingdom had openly declared in favour of the right of the Queen of Scots to the throne, after the death of Elizabeth, and were favourable to her restoration to her own country, on terms which he mentioned, but which did not include her marriage with the Duke of Norfolk.[2] On the 27th July, he said that the affairs of the Queen of Scots

[1] *Froude*, v. 9, pp. 454-456, but revised by the original.

[2] *Teulet's* "La Mothe," v. 2, p. 57.

were acquiring great solidity through the assistance of the Duke of Norfolk, who aspired to marry her, and he continued :—

"On pretence of giving assurance to the Queen of England of the promises and agreements which are to be made between them two selves [viz., Elizabeth and Mary], it seems she has already been induced to approve of her being married in England, and even in case she should subsequently not approve of it, the affair will not fail to be proceeded with; so far do matters seem to be advanced with the said Duke of Norfolk. To which the Queen of Scotland appears inclined not only to consent, but very strongly to desire it, as hoping by that means to enter into possession of the crown of England, after her cousin, considering the influence [*bonne part*] which the said Duke has with all the nobility, and great authority all over the country, and who is already causing it to be published every where that the right of the said lady is the most certain; so that the others who pretend to it are beginning to give up, notwithstanding the resistance of those of the new religion, some of the principal of whom are already gained for her, and notwithstanding that Cecil has been opposed to her hitherto, who now, out of regard for the Duke, appears likely to support more than any one else the party of the said lady." [1]

Thus matters stood at the end of July 1569. Mary, though hopeful, was suspicious. The adhesion of the English lords, who had addressed her, was important, yet she could scarcely believe that Elizabeth would consent to the marriage. She dreaded the vigilance of Cecil, notwithstanding the belief of La Mothe that he was veering to her side, and she feared treachery among her subordinate agents. In a letter to the French Ambassador, dated 10th August, Mary expresses doubts of the

[1] *Teulet's* "La Mothe," v. 2, pp. 126-7.—M. de la Mothe Fénélon's meaning may be apprehended, but his way of expressing it is very confused.

fidelity of one of his secretaries, and says that copies of her letters, and of those she had received from the King of France, had been sent to the English Court.

It was about this time the Queen of Scots wrote one of her most flattering letters to the Duke of Norfolk, declaring her unworthiness to be so well liked by one of such wisdom and good qualities. She was determined, she said, so to use herself, that with God's grace, he should never have cause to diminish his good conceit and favour of her, while she would esteem and respect him in all her doings as long as she lived. "This day," she continues, "I received a letter from you by this bearer, whereby I receive [perceive] the thought you take of my health, which, thanks to God, is much better than it was at his departing, but not yet very strong, nor quit of the soreness of my side." She had written, she said, to the Bishop of Ross what she heard from the Duke of Alva, and begged to know Norfolk's pleasure "at length in writing." To write to him she found no pains, but pleasure, as was also the receipt of his letters; and when the summer was passed she hoped for good all the year.[1]

Well might she hope, for not only had some of the most powerful of the English nobles shown themselves her friends, but in full council, on the 27th August, a vote was carried in favour of the settlement of the succession, by the marriage of the Queen of Scots with some English nobleman.[2] So prosperous was the appearance of affairs that plans of

[1] Mary to Norfolk, 24th.—*Labanoff*, v. 2, p. 368. [2] *Froude*, v. 9, p. 471.

escape were deemed unimportant, the Duke of Norfolk preferring to work in his own way, lest, in escaping from prison, Mary should slip from his hands, and marry a Spaniard. His hope was to force Elizabeth's consent, by the power and influence of his party. Early in September, the Earl of Pembroke sent word to the Spanish Ambassador, that the Queen *must* consent, because there was not a person about her that dared to give her different advice;[1] yet, within a week of this confident expectation, Elizabeth knew all that had been going on, and when Norfolk presented himself at Court, he was greeted with one of those storms of abuse with which the Queen sometimes assailed the highest subjects of the land.

The mischief was out. All hope of the Norfolk marriage, with the goodwill of the Queen of England, was at an end, and Elizabeth's first thought was for the safety of the prisoner at Wingfield. Without a day's delay she sent orders to the Earl of Huntingdon and Viscount Hereford, to render assistance to Shrewsbury; for in his desire to stand well with both parties, the Earl had caused himself to be distrusted by each.[2]

The state of Shrewsbury's health at this time afforded a convenient excuse for additional precautions. On the 12th September, he wrote to Cecil anticipating a return of the gout; and on the 18th,

[1] *Froude*, v. 9, p. 475.

[2] The Queen of Scots, in a letter to La Mothe, dated Sept. 20, says:—"I have found no reliance on my Lord Shrewsbury in the hour of my need, for all the fine speeches he made me formerly, yet I can in no wise depend on his promise."—*Strickland*, v. 1, p. 182.

when Mr. Skipwith, the Queen's messenger, reached him with the intimation that he should have the assistance of the Earl of Huntingdon and Viscount Hereford, in case of an attempt to escape, he at once assented, and asked for authority to levy men if he found it needful. In a letter to Cecil, conveying this assurance, Shrewsbury expressed a wish that the state of his body were such that he could serve the Queen as he would. From want of rest and continual pains, he hourly feared extreme danger to his life, by relapse, notwithstanding all council of physic that he could use in this his restless charge; and he begged Cecil to help him to obtain release as soon as it might stand with her Majesty's pleasure.[1]

It was in this crisis of affairs that the projected journey to Sheffield was abandoned. On the 19th September, Shrewsbury wrote to the Queen, urging his illness as a reason why she should with the more speed have consideration to his great charge.[2]

Knowing well that Mary's friends might be expected from the North, Shrewsbury determined not to advance to meet them, but sent for Lords Huntingdon and Hereford. These noblemen arrived at Wingfield on Monday, the 19th September, the day Mr. Skipwith left, and on the Wednesday following, they wrote to Cecil narrating their proceedings. Shrewsbury, they said, told them what Skipwith had brought him from the Queen, and said he thought it would be convenient to remove the Queen of

[1] Shrewsbury to Cecil, Sept. 18.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 14.

[2] Shrewsbury to Elizabeth, Sept. 19.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 15.

Scots; but to go to Sheffield, as he had before determined, he now utterly misliked, because the Queen, his charge, desired to go thither. He had sent for his provision back again, and concluded to take her to Tutbury, whither she was that day going, and the two lords had agreed to accompany him at his earnest request. Huntingdon saw the Queen of Scots for the first time on Tuesday night, at evening prayer, when the sum of her talk, as Shrewsbury also heard, was of

"The unkind and strait dealing of our sovereign towards her, into whose hands she said she had committed herself, hoping of her Majesty's aid against her enemies, and now when she most assuredly looked to reap the fruit of her hope, which was to be restored home to her country, she was now in utter despair thereof, for that her hope of going homewards took so contrary effect. For (to use her own term), she said, 'Tytteburye was fromwarde her heame' [home]. But, saith she, 'If my good sister will do nothing for me, then I will try what other princes will do for me.' 'But for this speech,' remark the writers, 'you can better judge than we, of what force it is.'"

Mary greatly desired to send one of her servants to London with letters, using many devices to obtain permission, but Shrewsbury refused, and Huntingdon advised him to do so, till he heard again from the Queen.[1]

Shrewsbury's letter narrating his version of these transactions is dated from Tutbury, on the following day. He said the Queen had been safely removed, and he thought it requisite (and Huntingdon and Hereford approved) to forbear going to Sheffield, although provision had been made, and to remove

[1] Huntingdon and Hereford to Cecil, dated Wingfield, Sept. 21.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 18.

the Queen of Scots to her Majesty's Castle of Tutbury. There she arrived on the night of the 21st Sept., accompanied by the three lords. Shrewsbury was moved to the resolution of carrying her to Tutbury by the weakness of Sheffield in many ways, although Tutbury was not strong; and also because Huntingdon and Hereford would be nearer, to assist in any event. The Queen of Scots, at the first motion of her removal, showed herself loath and unwilling, "though she came hither quietly in outward appearance, without much gainsaying, or uttering any undecent words or affections." On the way she talked somewhat with Huntingdon.[1]

The return of the Queen of Scots to Tutbury marked an epoch in her captivity, and was signalized by a striking change from the lenient treatment she had been receiving during the summer. Huntingdon, who was at first only ordered to assist Shrewsbury, in the event of any attempt to escape, was now formally instructed to supercede him. The Queen's order was dated the 22nd September, and, after commencing with the allegation, "that our cousin of Shrewsbury is much troubled with sickness, and like to fall further into the same, in such sort as he neither presently is able, nor shall be to continue in the charge which he hath to keep the Queen of Scots," the document proceeded to direct Huntingdon to repair with all speed to Lord Shrewsbury's house, with some of his trusty servants, and there take charge of the said Queen. After conference with Shrewsbury, he was to devise

[1] Shrewsbury to Cecil, Sept. 22.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 19.

how the number of the Queen of Scots' train might be diminished to only thirty persons, and to give order "that no such common resort be to the Queen as hath been, nor that she have such liberty to send posts as she hath done, to the great burden of our poor subjects." In a postscript to this letter Elizabeth says:—

"We will that no person be suffered to come from the Queen of Scots with any message or letter, but if she will write to us, you shall offer to send the same by one of yours; and so we will you to do, for our meaning is that for a season she shall neither send nor receive any message or letters without our knowledge."[1]

Huntingdon reported that he found nothing suspicious. On the contrary, every disposition had been made in a manner that he fully approved. Elizabeth's wishes for the reduction of Mary's attendants had been anticipated, and, in Huntingdon's opinion, Shrewsbury was fully competent to continue in charge. For himself, he asked permission to retire to his house at Ashby, where he would be at hand if wanted, while the change would spare him the unpleasantness of acting as spy in another's man's house.[2] His letter expressing these views was written on the 24th September, and ere it arrived at Court, the impolicy of the orders of the 22nd had struck even Elizabeth. On the 25th, she practically revoked them, by sending a commission to the Earls of Shrewsbury and Huntingdon, and to Viscount Hereford, making them joint custodians of the Queen of Scots, renewing injunctions for her

[1] Elizabeth to Huntingdon, Sept. 22.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 21.

[2] Huntingdon to Cecil, 24th Sept.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 21.

safe custody, in consequence of the Duke of Norfolk, who had proposed to marry her, having fled from the Court; and directing them to remove any suspected persons, to reduce the number of her attendants, to confine her to the Castle, and search the coffers of herself and her servants for any writings.[1]

Meanwhile Elizabeth's order of September 22nd, giving Huntingdon sole charge, arrived at Tutbury, and threw the household into commotion. Shrewsbury was both hurt and indignant, and Mary was bitter with anger. She regarded Huntingdon as a personal enemy, because he made some pretensions to the succession, on the strength of his descent from Margaret, Countess of Salisbury, daughter of George, Duke of Clarence. Mary therefore wrote a vigorous protest to the French Ambassador, asking him to judge if even her life was in safety.[2]

Shrewsbury was too much of a courtier to utter all he felt, and with some dexterity of interpretation, affected to understand the orders to Huntingdon as an association of that Earl with himself in the commission. He thanked Elizabeth for her consideration in making the arrangement, but begged, however, that as his health was restored, he might still be continued in his post.[3] To Sir William

[1] Elizabeth to Shrewsbury and Huntingdon, Sept. 25.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 22.

[2] In the postscript to this letter, the Queen of Scots says:—"Since this letter was written, Huntingdon is returned, having absolute charge of me from the Queen. The Earl of Shrewsbury, at my request, has petitioned that I should not be removed from his custody, and will keep me until the second despatch. I pray you to point out what an injustice it is against the law of the country, to place me in the hands of one who pretends to the crown like myself. You know also the great difference of religion. I pray you also write, and that favourably, for the *ship* of the said Earl of Shrewsbury, by the bearer, and let it be secret."—*Teulet*, v. 2, p. 265.

Shrewsbury to Elizabeth, Sept. 25—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 23.

Cecil he ventured to be a little more candid, entreating that he might be saved the discredit of having any one joined with him in his charge.[1]

To emphasise these entreaties, John Bateman, the Earl's secretary, wrote to Cecil, speaking of the recovery of his master's health, and describing his grief that he should be superseded with so little cause, and with so much appearance of discredit, at a time when he was really using every effort, acting with perfect loyalty to his sovereign, increasing his own servants, and diminishing the number of those of the Queen of Scots.[2]

Elizabeth's alarm and distrust had clearly carried her too far, but none knew better than she how to retreat from a false position. When, therefore, the bad effect of her action had become apparent, she wrote a soothing letter to "her cousin of Shrewsbury," assuring him that no manner of doubt of his fidelity or diligence had moved her to give him any assistance in his charge, but only that she thought it expedient, since the sudden departure of the Duke of Norfolk from London, without her knowledge.[3] Shrewsbury, quite mollified, explained to Cecil the reasons of his sensitiveness, but admitted that he was now glad to have assistance.[4]

The Duke of Norfolk, quitting the Court abruptly, and without leave, after his stormy interview with the Queen, sent word to the Earl of Northumber-

[1] Shrewsbury to Cecil, 25th Sept.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 24.
[2] Bateman to Cecil, 26th Sept.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 25.
[3] Elizabeth to Shrewsbury, 26th Sept.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 26.
[4] Shrewsbury to Cecil, 29th Sept.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 30.

land to postpone the insurrection that had been designed, and himself retired to Kenninghall, in Norfolk. Thither he was followed by a royal messenger, summoning him to the presence of the Queen; but, as he was obeying the command, travelling between London and Windsor, he was arrested, and on the 8th of October, Sir Francis Knollys received an order to conduct him to the Tower. The Northern Earls fumed and fretted at the weakness of their co-conspirator, but it seemed for the time as if nothing would come of their vexation. By the end of October, men high in office fancied the storm had blown over; and Norfolk, regarding the game as played out, was using every device to make peace with his sovereign.

The even tenor of events at Tutbury was almost daily disturbed by the intrigues of the captive Queen, and by the suspicions of the reigning one. Having alighted upon the threads of the Norfolk conspiracy, Elizabeth was anxious to trace it in all its ramifications, and instructed Huntingdon and Shrewsbury to question their prisoner closely about the letter she received in July, from the Earls of Pembroke and Leicester. Mary admitted the receipt of one letter, signed by both these Earls, and conveyed to her by the Bishop of Ross, since Whitsuntide, but the letter she would not show, nor say where it was. She offered to send for it, if they would let her, but their offer to send for it on her behalf, she declined.[1] The same messenger who carried the intelligence of

[1] Shrewsbury and Huntingdon to Queen Elizabeth, October 10th.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 35.

this interview between the two Earls and the Queen of Scots, was the bearer also of a letter from the Earl of Huntingdon to Cecil, saying that he gathered from Mary's speeches that the letters were not in her keeping, nor in Scotland, nor with the Bishop of Ross.

"Almost in plain words," he adds, "she uttered to me alone no less, but I took it somewhat too hastily, which I was sorry for, and then she called it back again, saying I should not know where her credit was in England."

Passing to another subject, Huntingdon continues:—

"We have reduced her number to 32 persons, and all the rest be gone. She is now in good quiet, and not without great hope, though she would have us to think she is in utter despair, to receive any good by England."[1]

The condition of the Queen of Scots at this time was indeed miserable. Shut up within the enclosure of the poor Castle of Tutbury, debarred from correspondence, mocked with an outward show of state and ceremony, yet really subject to rude intrusion, she had every reason to regard her future prospects as gloomy in the extreme. Her situation is well illustrated by the occurrences arising out of an order, dated the 25th September, directing the two Earls to search her coffers, and those of her servants, for writings that might implicate her in the Norfolk conspiracy, an order that was carried out with such

[1] Huntingdon to Cecil, Oct. 10th.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 36. —The French Ambassador, in a letter dated October 28th, informed his master that the Queen of Scots on being questioned about these letters, replied that she had sent them to her nobility, and to her Council in her kingdom, to obtain their advice, and that, if they would give her a passport, she would send to fetch them, and would place them, through the Bishop of Ross, in the possession of the said lady her good sister; which the said Earls did not accept, and told her that no step whatever will be taken in the despatch of her affairs until she has complied with this demand.—*Teulet's* "La Mothe," v. 2, p. 300.

unnecessary and ostentatious violence, that Mary made formal complaint.[1]

With a show of fairness, Shrewsbury and Huntingdon were called upon to explain their conduct, and this is their answer:—

"We have been advertised from Mr. Secretary that the Queen of Scots hath made complaint of us, for coming into her chamber with pistolets suddenly, to her great terror and fear. Indeed, we must confess that the same night we searched her coffers, some of our men, which did use to carry their pistolets, did wait on us to the doors, as they had done at other times before, and have done since. And to confess to your majesty the truth, one or two entered the chamber, and the rest followed, which we no sooner perceived but we turned back and made them all to stay, commanding both them without and within to lay aside the pistolets, which she doth very well know, and therefore we do marvel that for this she would complain of us; but as we know your majesty's pleasure to be that we should use her with gentleness and courtesy (foreseeing always the safety of her), so we hope that justly none shall accuse us of the contrary."[2]

On such questions as this Elizabeth was much more easily satisfied than when her suspicions were aroused about the loyalty of Shrewsbury. By her command, Cecil answered on the 13th of October, addressing his letter to the two Earls, allowing their manner of dealing and misliking her manner of answer touching the letters of the Earls of Pembroke

[1] In an autograph letter, addressed to Queen Elizabeth, and dated "From my prison at Tutbury, this 1st of October," Mary complains of the severity shown towards her servants, who are dismissed without the means of going where they might earn a livelihood; "and farther, the more grievous prohibition that I may receive no letter or message, or intelligence of my affairs in Scotland;" nor even to be allowed to hear of friends and kinsmen in France. "Instead of which they have forbid me to go out, and have rifled my trunks, entering my chamber with pistols and arms, not without putting me in bodily fear, and accusing my people, rifle them, and place them under arrest."—*Turnbull*, 173.

[2] Shrewsbury and Huntingdon to Elizabeth, Oct. 10.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 35.

and Leicester; telling them to keep Queen Mary from all intelligence, "at least as much as you may," and expressing satisfaction with the explanation about the incident of the pistolets.[1] The jealousies of Elizabeth were, however, perpetually springing up afresh, and every action of Shrewsbury received a sinister interpretation from either one Queen or the other.

On the 15th of October, Elizabeth writes to Shrewsbury, that she hears:—

"The Earl of Huntingdon remaineth there in other sort than our meaning is, or than is convenient (although from himself we hear it not), that is, that he hath no convenient lodging in that our Castle, meet for his calling and for his health, and his servants are constrained for their meals to depart into the town, being far distant thence."

Her Majesty does not know how the Earl takes this, nor whether it is as reported; but she desires that he may be better lodged, and his servants have their diet in the house. With some irony the Queen proceeds to observe that as by Shrewsbury's gentleness the Queen of Scots had increased the number of her servants more above the number assigned, than the Earl of Huntingdon's servants, no difficulty ought to be made in allowing for them. She is the more moved thus to order it, because she hears that no small number of his servants have been seduced to favouring of some practices in the house, against the Earl's mind, and without his knowledge. The Queen asks him to discover if this continues, and assures him her enquiries do not arise from distrust of his loyalty. She has not more

[1] Cecil to Shrewsbury and Huntingdon, Oct. 13.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 25.

confidence in any one in the realm, but hears of sundry practices intended to abuse both herself and him. In a postscript, her Majesty says she thinks the desire shown in his former letters, to have the sole charge of the Queen, without the Earl of Huntingdon, does not come of himself, but of some about him "too much affectionated to her."[1] The cruel missive struck home, and Huntingdon, if he had not complained before, found cause to complain of the treatment he received from Shrewsbury after the Queen had exercised her friendly offices on his behalf. He wrote to Cecil that nothing was imparted to him plainly, but something uttered in dark and choleric terms.[2]

Shrewsbury replied both to the Queen and to Cecil. To the Queen, he said his desire to have the sole charge proceeded solely from himself, and for no other respect but his earnest zeal and affection to serve her. As to the Earl of Huntingdon's lodgings, he was placed here next best to the Queen of Scots. Lest perchance he might mislike it, Shrewsbury required him to choose some other place, but he refused to move, seeming contented. As to Huntingdon's servants, those that had not tarried at meals had been sundry times moved by Shrewsbury's officers to tarry. However, allowance should now be made for them as the Queen wished. Though the Queen of Scots' number of servants was diminished, the diet was not diminished from what it was at Bolton, or any time since. As to her sus-

[1] Elizabeth to Shrewsbury, Oct. 15th.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 42.—A draft in Cecil's hand.

[2] Huntingdon to Cecil, Oct. 19th.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 45.

picions of his household, he is most careful, vigilant, and suspicious of every person about him, but he could not find by examination, or any other trial, that they were not true and faithful. Before coming to Tutbury, he sent away some, seeing cause to fear of their seducement. If he could find any others, he would not fail to reveal them, that they might be ordered according to their deserts; and finally he comforted himself with her majesty's good opinion of him.[1]

Suspicion against the Countess of Shrewsbury also rankled in the breasts of both the Queens. Mary, writing to Walsingham, on the 20th October, warns him "to attach no credit to the schemes and accusations of the Countess who is now with you."[2] Elizabeth broadly hinted, through Cecil, her doubts of the Countess's loyalty. The Earl replied warmly, repudiating the suspicions entertained against his wife, his servants, and himself,[3] and

[1] Shrewsbury to Elizabeth, 19th October, signed.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 43.

[2] *Chalmers*, v. 1, p. 330.

[3] The following is the letter :—

Shrewsbury to Cecil.

"Sir—I have reseyvyd your letter, thenkeng my celfe beholdenge unto you for your frendly car ovar me. I here to my grefe that suspycion is hadde offe ovar myche goodwyll boron by my vyfe to this Quene, and offe untrw delyng by my men. For my vyfe, thus muste I seye, che hathe not otherwyes delte with that Quene than I have bene preve unto and that I have hadd lykeng offe, and by my apoyntement hathe so delte that I have bene the mor abull to descharge the truste commytted unto me. And if che for hur dutyfull delynge to hur Majestie and true menynge to me should be suspected that I am sure hath so well desarved, che and I myght thenke our celfes unfortunate. And wher I perseve hur Majestie is lett to undarstande that by my vyfes persuasion, I am the more desyrus to contynew this charge, I speke it afore God, che hathe bene in hande with me as farre as che durste and mor than I thought well offe, cynste my sykenes to perquire my descharge. I am nott to be ledde by hur otharwyes than I thynke well off. Sir, if I hadde nott founde my celfe well recovered and som aperans of sarves, I wold have bene a numbull soutar for my dyspache—and now fyndenge my celfe in helthe and as vell abull to sarve hur Majestie as before and my men being in suspycion that hath truly & pen-

received in reply a soothing letter from Cecil, dated "From Wyndsor Castle, ye 4 of Noveb. 1569," assuring him that the Queen's letters and messages.

"Proceed not of any evil judgment towards any of you; but sometime when she heareth this or that, she suddenly is moved to send or write more upon some inward care she hath for the surety of that Queen, than for any mistrust anywise."

The letter ends with a recommendation to "use all manner of circumspection to avoid secret practices."[1] Shrewsbury answered this communication with renewed expressions of loyalty, and thus, for the time, closed the controversy.[2]

Meanwhile, Elizabeth was renewing her injunctions to the two Earls to keep the Queen of Scots safely, in consequence of many things which had come to her understanding, since the discovery of her intended marriage with the Duke of Norfolk,[3]

fully sarved, home I dar answar forre as farre as any man wyll doo for his sarvantes—my humble sute is that those that ethar of males orre forre othar pryvate respectes hathe sought thus to incense hur Majestie that they maye justefye there sayenge tha[t] trauth maye apere, and than I am sur there wyll no cause of suspycion move hur Majestie now in this to my discredytt to take hur from me and to commytt the charge to my L. of Huntyngdon, home I thynke nott my celfe no wes inferior for hur heygnes sarves, if her hyghnes wyll inabull me—and I truste I have bettar desarved than to be dyscharged to my deskredytt, sarvinge hur Majestie and hur nobull progenytors, as I and my aunsistores have done, and whan hur Majestie shall have better tryall offe me and myne in this sarves of my trw and fethefull delynge, and that the worlde shall nott thynk che is removed for anny wante in me orre othar suspycyons, I shall than be moste wylleng to be anumbull sutar that I may with hur Majestees favore be relesed of this charge. What suspycyon I have that the Quenes Majestie hath harde of thes untrw reportes by Morton orr by some that he hath utterid it unto, I refarre it to Mr Scipvythes declaracion—And nott douteng in your frendly delynge for me, I wysch you as to my celfe. From the Quenes Majesties castell of Tutbury, this xxx Octobar, 1569.

Your assured frende. G. Shrouesbury."

Holograph, Add. Endd.—MSS. Mary Queen of Scots, v. IV, No. 48. I have copied this letter exactly, being in Shrewsbury's own hand, and evidently written under the influence of strong feeling. It is a good example of the Earl's eccentric orthography.

[1] Cecil to Shrewsbury, Nov. 4.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 26.

[2] Shrewsbury to Cecil, 9th Nov.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 59.

[3] Elizabeth to Shrewsbury and Huntingdon, Oct. 28th.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 47.

and the Earls assured her they would always be able to give a good account of the person of the captive.[1] The strictness of Mary's confinement at this time moved the King of France, her brother-in-law, to remonstrate. She had continued, notwithstanding all the vigilance of her keepers, to convey letters to M. de la Mothe Fénélon, who wrote to the King: "She is treated with great severity, but has found means to forward to me four letters enclosed, which I really believe she has written without light. I assure your majesty they will move you to compassion."[2] The four letters never reached the French King, for the messenger who carried the despatches was assaulted and robbed of them, about three miles from the house of Lord Cobham; but his majesty, nevertheless, heard of Mary's distress, and instructed his ambassador to remonstrate vigorously. The effect was soon apparent. Elizabeth discovered, rather suddenly, that Shrewsbury was sufficiently recovered to have sole charge, and gave Huntingdon permission to depart, a liberty of which he was not slow to avail himself. The order for his release was dated November 4th. On Monday, the 7th, he took leave of Tutbury, "well contented and friendly," as Shrewsbury thought.[3] Mary herself wrote to Elizabeth, and to Cecil, long letters of complaint, setting forth her troubles, and entreating some consideration; and these representations, seconded by those of the King of France, and coming

[1] Shrewsbury and Huntingdon to Elizabeth, Oct. 31st.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 49.

[2] *Strickland*, v. I, p. 187.

[3] Shrewsbury to Cecil, Nov. 9th.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 59.

at a time when Cecil supposed the threatened rebellion in the north "was a vain smoke without any spark of any account,"[1] brought about the desired change. On the 18th November, La Mothe was able to write to his master:—

"The Queen of Scots has sent me tidings that she is better treated, and already feels the benefit of the negotiation your very Christian majesties made in her behalf with this Queen, her cousin, notwithstanding the great wrath still borne against her; she has withdrawn Huntingdon and his men, so that for the present she is in the hands of the Earl of Shrewsbury alone, and both he and his Countess behave in all things truly and honourably to the said Queen of Scots.[2]

Shrewsbury was tolerably strict, however, in supervising the correspondence of his unwilling guest. In the letter announcing Huntingdon's departure, which is dated November 9th, he relates how Sandy Bog came the night before, from the Bishop of Ross, with a passport and letters to the Queen. Shrewsbury read the letters, according to Elizabeth's order, and then Sandy Bog, in his presence, delivered them to Mary. Sandy was at once removed to the custody of the chief porter, where he would remain without conferring with his mistress or any other, until she sent him back with an answer, which the Earl would peruse. Shrewsbury suggested that letters to Queen Mary should be seen, allowed, and marked, so that he might know it before delivering them, for although he could not allege any evil thing presently meant by letters, he considered that in plain show of

[1] Cecil to Huntingdon and Shrewsbury, 13th Oct.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 26.

[2] *Strickland*, v. 1, p. 193.

writing, there might be sometimes other matter contained than at first sight would appear.[1]

Confinement and anxiety told their usual tale upon the Queen of Scots. Her health, never strong, invariably became worse when she was engaged in a campaign upon Elizabeth's compassion. Accordingly, on the 9th November, Shrewsbury found it needful to write to his sovereign, and say:—

"It may further please your Majesty, this said Queen on Saturday night last complained much of grief and pain of her side, her heart, and head, and suffered then a painful fit. And on the night following her fit increased, whereat she showed herself somewhat afraid of her life. Since that time she remains still complaining of faintness at her heart, and pain of her head, whereof I thought meet to advertise your majesty. She hath not, nor shall not have any access unto her but myself, my wife, and her own ordinary. Truly her colour and complexion of her face is presently much decayed. She meaneth to take medicine to-morrow by order of her own physician. Whereupon if any accident follow to be considered, I will make humble advertisement unto your majesty with all diligence."[2]

A week later, he was able to add the information that the Queen took the medicine immediately after he wrote, and complained of being very sick therewith. She had also taken baths, and for the last three days had not been half an hour out of bed. So far as he could see, her body was much distempered, but without danger. Nevertheless he would look as surely to her as if she had her best health, and practiced nothing else but for her escape. He and his wife were not out of her company two

[1] Shrewsbury to Cecil, Nov. 9th.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 59.

[2] Shrewsbury to Elizabeth, Nov. 9.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 58.

hours any time from morning till midnight, beside other watching and warding.[1]

From contemplating the Queen's symptoms, the household at Tutbury was rudely awakened in the middle of November. The nobles and gentry of the northern counties had lost all patience with the pusillanimous Norfolk and his friends in the south. Their plans were all laid, and delay was more dangerous than action, seeing that their proceedings must soon reach the ears of the Government. Still the chiefs hesitated before taking the fatal plunge. The Earl of Northumberland was himself scarcely more resolute than Norfolk, but he had a resolute wife, and was surrounded by impatient friends and vassals. At length action was resolved on; the bells at Topcliff rang backwards, and all the country was aroused. A considerable force collected around the standard of the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, and, for a time, the rising assumed alarming proportions. On the 14th November, the Earls entered Durham, and heard mass in the Cathedral. On the 19th, they were at Ripon; on the 20th, at Knaresborough; on the 23rd, the main body of their army was at Wetherby and Tadcaster, and a dash on Tutbury, with a body of light horsemen, was in contemplation.

On the 17th, news of the outbreak reached Shrewsbury, who wrote at once to Cecil, announcing the addition to his force of 100 men, with armour and weapons, and telling him also that he had caused scouts to watch nightly on horseback a good distance

[1] Shrewsbury to Cecil, Nov. 17th.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 63.

from the house, and that he intended with all speed to entrench and strengthen the weak places about the Castle. He had also given orders to search the parts six miles round, to see what armour and weapons there were above the ordinary.[1]

The tide of rebellion rolled yet nearer, and Shrewsbury was alarmed. On the 21st, he again wrote to Cecil, having just heard that on Saturday, the Earls were at Tadcaster, eight miles southwards of York, threatening to stop the passage of the Lord Lieutenant. They were then not more than fifty-four miles from Tutbury. Shrewsbury wished the Queen to consider his charge, and think of his position. He would do his best, with the aid of Huntingdon and Hereford, but he reminded her that he had not authority to levy forces, and could only collect his own servants and tenants. The Castle, too, was very weak, and not able to resist for any length of time, though it might hold good against a sudden assault. He trusted Queen Elizabeth had given orders to meet the enemy in the field; and begged to know her pleasure with all speed.[2]

Resolution to meet the rebellion, as it ought to be met, seemed to be the one thing that Elizabeth was incapable of. She declined to spend money, and made light of the whole affair, until Lord Hunsdon, who was travelling northwards, roused her to a comprehension of the situation, when he found the rebels in possession of the country between Doncaster and York. In urgent language Hunsdon

[1] Shrewsbury to Cecil, Nov. 17th.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 63.
[2] Shrewsbury to Cecil, 21st Nov.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 64.

counselled the Queen to send aid to the Earl of Sussex, who was afraid to leave York with the small force at his command; and to remove the Queen of Scots with all speed from Tutbury. Sir Ralph Sadler, who had been sent to the assistance of the Earl of Sussex, was compelled to follow Lord Hunsdon across the Humber, and so reach York by a long detour. He also wrote of the strength of the rebels, and the need for prompt relief.[1]

On one point at least resolution was taken. An order to the Earl of Shrewsbury, despatched on the 22nd November, directed him to remove the Queen of Scots instantly to Coventry. Cecil, writing from Windsor, on the 26th, said to Sir Ralph Sadler:—

"Yesterday the Queen of Scots was removed from Tutbury to Ashby, and we make assured account she shall be in Coventry this night."[2]

But Shrewsbury was even more prompt than the impatient Secretary gave him credit for, for on the 25th, he was able to announce the safe arrival of his charge in the city of Lady Godiva, where she was lodged at an Inn.[3] Huntingdon, who had re-

[1] Sadler to Elizabeth, November 26th.—*Sadler Papers*, v. 2, p. 311.—From the accounts of the Town Trustees of Sheffield, we find that a tax was levied on the inhabitants, and soldiers were equipped to join the Queen's army that was gathering at Doncaster; and when the Burgesses had transacted this momentous business, they dined together at Walton's public house. Four men were sent to York, and twelve lay for some time at Doncaster without being called upon to meet the enemy. What was thus done in Sheffield was doubtless a counterpart of the proceedings in every other parish in the northern counties.—*Extracts from the Earliest Book of Accounts of the Town Trustees of Sheffield*, 1566 *to* 1707, pp. 20 et seq.

[2] Cecil to Sadler, Nov. 26.—*Sadler Papers*, v. 2, p. 310.

[3] The Inn to which the Queen of Scots was first brought and lodged, was the Bull Inn, at that time standing in Smithford street; its site is now occupied by the Barracks. The first court-yard from the street conveys the impression of an ancient hostelry. In Reader's History of Coventry, it is stated that Mary was removed from Tutbury to Coventry, and kept there as a prisoner, from S. Andrew's Day (Nov. 30) to Candlemas (Feb. 2), by the Earls of Shrewsbury and Huntingdon, and that the citizens kept watch and ward, day and night, at every gate, that none might pass without examination. She

joined Shrewsbury, assisted at the removal, and united with him in a letter to Queen Elizabeth. At the same time, Shrewsbury wrote in his own name to Cecil, dating his letter "Coventry, 25th November." The Queen had arrived here, he said, late in the evening, to avoid "fond gazing, and confluence of the people." He will keep her from access and view as much as possible, as long as she remains here, for the more she is seen and acquainted, the greater the danger. Nottingham Castle, in his opinion, would have been a much more convenient place than this. There he durst have gaged his life to have kept her safe from rebels, or other enemies of her majesty, so well he liked the disposition of the town and the gentlemen.[1]

Elizabeth conveyed her thanks in a letter of the 30th November, but, ever economical, she desires the two Earls to discharge the extra guard they had engaged, and retain only so many as were at Tutbury. The sojourn at an inn she disapproved, and directed them to remove the Queen of Scots to some convenient house, the Earl of Huntingdon remaining to assist the Earl of Shrewsbury.[2]

To this communication Huntingdon and Shrewsbury replied on the 2nd December. As to her Majesty's desire that the Queen of Scots should not

was afterwards removed to Tutbury again. The City annals, in 1569, say, "the Queen of Scots brought hither prisoner, and kept in the Mayoress's parlour at St Mary's Hall, and from hence to Titbury." The Mayoress's parlour here named, is a large room adjoining the Great Hall at the eastern side of the north end, and in the tower (which is near the south end of the Great Hall) is a small chamber which is traditionally pointed out as having been her prison room.—*Notes kindly furnished by Mr. Wm. Geo. Fretton, F.S.A., of Coventry.*

[1] Shrewsbury to Cecil, Nov. 25th.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 68.

[2] Elizabeth to Shrewsbury and Huntingdon, Nov. 30th.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 77.

long lie in this city, or any such place, but rather in some strong house, about which she asks their opinions, they know none hereabouts which would suit, for the Queen does not wish her to go south. They can name no strong place or castle of the Queen's, except Nottingham, which they think to be most sure and convenient. The letter continues:—

"And where your Majesty doth mislike with the lodging of this Queen in an inn, it may please you to understand that upon Mr. Skipwith's coming, by whom your highness did send your commandment for the bringing of her hither, we did immediately send our men to prepare a lodging for her, and gave them in charge to get either Mr. Hales' house, or some merchant's, which by no means upon so short warning could be obtained, and since our coming hither, we have done the best we could to prepare a lodging, which till this day could not be made ready for want of necessary stuff, whereof I, the Earl of Shrewsbury, could not be provided of in such a sudden, for want of carriages, which in this time was not to be gotten. And we humbly beseech your Majesty to think of us, that we did so much mislike to lodge her thus, as we knew it to be a very unfit place for her, but specially because we were assured it would offend your Majesty, till you understood the necessity that caused it. And for the removing of her, as we did provide for it before the receipt of your Majesty's letters, so we do appoint that it shall be this night or to-morrow, for sooner the house where she shall lie could not be prepared."[1]

On the 10th December, Shrewsbury was able to inform Sir William Cecil that the Queen of Scots was lodged at Coventry, in a house, late the Lord Chief Baron's. He confesses that it is not so fit for her continuance, being in a city, as other houses of more strength by themselves, but it is the fittest

[1] Shrewsbury and Huntingdon to Elizabeth, Dec. 2,—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 79.

in the city, or the neighbourhood; and he is able to speak from personal knowledge, for he "has diligently viewed and perused them all." Now that she is quietly settled here, he says, in the surest place from sight and view of the people, or any access, he cannot see how she can conveniently be moved before Christmas, for no due provision can be made, nor conveyance prepared. The town, he complains, is very costly to him, and he adds, "I trust you will have me in your friendly remembrance for money."[1]

Such was the picture presented, when Shrewsbury had a hand in the painting. He was obeying the Queen's orders, and acting with zeal and discretion, under trying and difficult circumstances. But there were about him persons who put a very different colouring on his actions. His colleague, the Earl of Huntingdon, whom we find joining Shrewsbury in writing letters, such as we have quoted, had the meanness to write behind his back in a very different strain. Either his joint letters, or his private letters, were misrepresentations. If he had had any legitimate ground of complaint against Shrewsbury, how could he unite with him in signing such letters as those of November 25th and December 2nd? A man of honour would have withheld his hand from such admissions, and avowed an intention of writing on his own account; but it pleased him to play the spy. Knowing full well that he was sowing the seed of suspicion, in ground well prepared to receive it, Huntingdon

[1] Shrewsbury to Cecil, Dec. 10th.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 85.

played the hypocrite before Shrewsbury's face, and behind his back wrote to Cecil flatly denying every assertion, in which, with Shrewsbury, he had concurred. Even Elizabeth appears to have placed a true value upon Huntingdon's disclosures, for instead of discharging Shrewsbury, she very soon took an opportunity of relieving his accuser of an employment for which he was unfitted.

On the 28th November, Huntingdon wrote to Mr. Secretary, saying of the Queen of Scots:—"She lieth in an inn, where for me there is no lodging; her men also lie in the town and go where they will, so as they may practice how they list." He has found another house, he says, but they cannot go thither for lack of stuff, though he has sought it among the citizens, but they have not yet answered him. His companion (Shrewsbury) has brought none and will send for none until he knows whether he will continue in charge, of which he seems doubtful. Huntingdon himself makes no provision, as he looks not to tarry here, and he urges the Queen to make known her pleasure.[1]

On the following day he wrote again, complaining that no secrets were kept from the Queen, nor resort of strangers prevented.[2] In another letter bearing

[1] Huntingdon to Cecil, Nov. 28th.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 70.

Huntingdon to Cecil.—"Sir, we received by the pursuivant letters, as may appear by our postscript, which I caused to be written, for else nothing had been written, as nothing shall be done. For as I have written to you already, nothing that we do determine is kept above four days—I am sure this hath been the manner, and I am sure it cannot be altered by no command, were it never so strait. *Quod natura dedit, nemo tollere potest.* Farther, there is nothing written that is not told her, by whom I cannot say, Thus I still walk the dangerous path, if you deal not the more friendly with me. But God is witness, it is the regard of my duty and the weight of the cause which moveth me to note those things, and no other respect. I have upon receipt of your letters been in hand with my lord to remove her, for where she lieth she

the same date he says:—The Queen is still lodged in an inn, of which Cecil can consider the unfitness. Lord Shrewsbury looks to return with her to Nottingham or to be discharged. Of the first alternative he often speaks. Huntingdon does not know whether he writes of it.

"This Queen," continues Huntingdon, "would fain come to Windsor to be a courtier. If I be not deceived, she doth cast for it. She would fain have us to write to her Majesty of her humble yielding to her highness pleasure for her remove from Tutbury. When our first letters were sent, it should have been written by her will, but neither my lord nor I did think it fit. You write that you would have her to be kept from sight and conference, but I must tell you that neither is done, nor will be done above 4 days together. Yet that it is most convenient, I must grant, and I have spoken for it, but more I cannot do neither in this nor anything else. If I feared my tarrying in this charge, with this companion long, I would renew my old suit for respect of her Majesty's service and discharge of duty that way, and not for my self, for surely I cannot be matched with one that will use me the more friendly; but you know what moveth me hereto, and therefore I leave it." He has provided another house and would fain take her thither, but my lord will not. Caused necessaries to be provided, by the help of the magistrates of the city, who are most forward in her Majesty's service. Coventry, 29 November, 1569.[1]

Thus was Huntingdon attempting to undermine Shrewsbury's influence, and destroy his credit. According to his representation, nothing could be

seeth and is seen, neither hath any restraint been used for those things since we came. We do nothing whatsoever it be but we make her privy thereof. I have many times said that to do and say nothing were the best, but I can but speak and give advice, to others the order belongeth. Even upon this letter brought to us now, I am occasioned to write thus much. I pray you consider of me herein friendly, for the trouble is many ways great, and the worst is, her Majesty is not served. God keep you, and end these miserable days shortly. From Coventry, this 29 of November. Yours, H. Huntyngdon."—*Hol. p.* 1, *Add. Endorsed.—MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 71.

[1] Huntingdon to Cecil.—*Hol.—MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 72.

more careless than the watch that was kept upon the Queen and her people; according to Mary, nothing could be more rigorous. The Bishop of Ross, writing to Leicester, entreats him to move her Majesty to have pity on the condition of his mistress.[1] Mary, writing to Cecil, complains of the Earl of Shrewsbury for having removed certain of her attendants, especially her palfreniers and lacqueys, "that did attend upon the keeping of our horses, without whom we could not have travelled this last voyage, nor cannot afterwards be served in case we be forced to remove to any other place."[2]

Her letters were stopped and tampered with, and the Bishop of Ross even went so far as to allege that her life was in imminent danger.[3]

Amidst these complaints the year drew towards a close. The northern rebels never pushed their advance further south than Tadcaster. Without an engagement, their forces melted away, and ere December expired, the chiefs had taken refuge among the borderers of Scotland, and the smaller men had returned to their homes, trusting to escape punishment by their obscurity. Elizabeth, as a prelude to her Christmas festivities, ordered Shrewsbury and Huntingdon to return with the Queen of Scots to Tutbury, where Shrewsbury was to remain in charge, and Huntingdon repair to the Court.[4]

This order was acknowledged by the two Earls

[1] Ross to Leicester, 28th Nov.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 69.

[2] Mary to Cecil, 4th Dec.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 81.

[3] Ross to Elizabeth, 24th Dec.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 92.

[4] Elizabeth to Shrewsbury and Huntingdon, 24th Dec.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, IV., 93.

on the 28th December. Shrewsbury at once gave orders for preparing the house at Tutbury, "It shall be ready," say the Earls, "on Monday next, though it will be very hard and chargeable." To do it sooner was impossible, for want of provision and other necessaries, but they promised to start on the 2nd January, intending to reach their destination the same night.[1]

The promise was well kept. On the 3rd January, Shrewsbury informed Cecil that the Queen of Scots had been brought to Tutbury the night before. Her servants were very loath to prepare in the morning, and tried to make delays, but understanding their meaning, the Earl brought her out of Coventry sooner than they would, with quietness, and little sight of people.[2] Thus ended, as far as the Queen of Scots was concerned, the adventure of the northern rebellion.

Several letters of the Earl of Shrewsbury, written at the end of 1569, afford us a suggestive glimpse of the condition of the common people, and remind us of burdens then borne, which have long since fallen from English shoulders. It was the 28th December. Shrewsbury had just received orders to return with the Queen of Scots to Tutbury, and in a tone of explanation and remonstrance, he wrote that the tenants and others round Tutbury (which was a royal castle, forming part of the Duchy of Lancaster, and leased to the Earl of Shrewsbury),

[1] Shrewsbury and Huntington to Cecil, 28th Dec.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 94.

[2] Shrewsbury to Cecil, 3rd January, 1569-70.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. V., No. 2.

were lamentably burdened when Queen Mary was last there, though he had only called upon them to perform strictly necessary services. They will not, says Shrewsbury, continue to serve with their carriages without great exclamation, and indeed they are not able to do so, their beasts are so weak, the ways so deep and foul, and the fuel so far off to be fetched. He suggests that Queen Elizabeth should allow fuel to be taken from her park at Castle Hay, near Tutbury. This would be a great help to the people, and wood might be well spared off such old trees as are meet for nothing else but for the fire. The taking thereof would be profitable to the ground, and no harm to her Majesty's stud there. He asks for a speedy answer to this, as it will be much harder to make shift for carriages than formerly.[1]

Again, on the 3rd January, after announcing the Queen of Scots' arrival at Tutbury, Shrewsbury returns to this subject, and says he does not know how he can continue in Tutbury, unless the Queen will allow him to take fuel from Castle Hay Park. Otherwise, fuel is far off, the house is extremely cold, the ways are deep, and the carriages, both in Staffordshire and Derbyshire, weak, and consumed by the late service against the rebels.[2]

[1] Shrewsbury to Cecil, Dec. 28.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IV., No. 94.

[2] Shrewsbury to Cecil, 3rd Jan., 1569-70.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. v., No. 2.—While he was thus considerate for others, Shrewsbury was none the less feeling the pressure of his charge on his own resources. In a letter to the Marquis of Winchester, Lord Treasurer of England, and Sir Walter Mildmay, Chancellor of the Exchequer, dated 15th Jan., 1569-70, Shrewsbury asks for a larger allowance of wine, without impost ; his expenses are so much increased by the Queen of Scots. "Truly two tuns in a month have not hitherto sufficed ordinarily, besides that that is occupied at times for her bathing, and such like uses, which seeing I cannot by any means conveniently diminish, mine earnest trust and desire is that you will now consider me with such larger proportion in this case as shall seem good unto your friendly wisdoms."—*Talbot Papers*, p. 553.

Forced services, such as these, pressed heavily upon the people. When the Queen moved, the carts of the district were requisitioned to carry her baggage; when she resided at a country house, the neighbours had to bear the cost and trouble of conveying fuel and provisions. No wonder there was "great exclamation." Shrewsbury felt that he had already asked enough, and hesitated to press yet more grievous burdens on his neighbours and tenants.

CHAPTER V.

THE year 1570 opened upon the Queen of Scots with gloom and disappointment. During the past twelve months she had been alternately buoyed up with extravagant hopes, and plunged into despair; but when the old year ended, and the new year began, there was discouragement on every hand. Still the spirit of the Queen was indomitable. One adventure had failed, but nothing daunted, she applied herself at once to the task of reuniting the broken threads. The obnoxious Huntingdon had left her, and under the mild but firm rule of Shrewsbury, she trusted to improve her chances of escape. No sooner had Mary returned to Tutbury, than we find her playing the amiable part of making presents to her keeper. As she heard the Earl complain of Elizabeth's parsimony, the thought may have struck her, that her rival's meanness could be used for her own advantage. At all events, she tried the effect of a present, and at the end of January, Shrewsbury sent his servant, Henry Downes, to Berwick, to receive some hawks the Queen of Scots had promised him.[1] The acceptance of such a gift may have been indiscreet; Shrewsbury's courtly politeness perhaps led him to convey to the Queen of

[1] Shrewsbury to Sussex, Jan. 22.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. v., No. 3.

Scots more favourable impressions than he intended; but when the time of danger came, he was ever ready and vigilant, and Mary complained that nothing came of all his fair speeches.

The threads of the Norfolk conspiracy were once more taken up. The Duke was still in prison, but he was hoping for release through the completeness of his submission. Lest any suspicion of her sincerity should have crossed Norfolk's mind, Mary redoubled her protestations of affection.

"I pray you, my good lord," she says, "trust none that shall say that I ever mind to leave you, nor do any thing that may displease you, for I have determined never to offend you, but to remain yours; and though I should never buy it so dear, I think all well bestowed for your friendly dealings with me undeserved."[1]

The timid Duke was not easily aroused. It is even possible that patriotic thoughts were agitating his mind, and, though still playing at double dealing, he may have tried to persuade himself that loyalty was the wisest and the safest course. He had ventured, however, on a slippery path, and entangled himself in the toils of one who was not inclined to permit so useful an ally to slip from her grasp. Finding him hesitate, Mary soon followed up her first letter with another, driving the spur deep into his side. She wrote on the last of January, to "mine own good lord," subscribing herself, "your own, faithful to death, Queen of Scots, my Norfolk." She says:—

"I wrote to you before, to know your pleasure, if I should seek to make any enterprise; if it please you, I care not for my

[1] *Strickland*, v. 1, p. 197.

danger; but I would wish you would seek to do the like, for if you and I should escape both, we should find friends enough, and for your lands, I hope they should not be lost, for being free and honourably bound together, you might make such good offers for the countries, and the Queen of England, as they should not refuse. Our fault were not shameful; you have promised to be mine, and I yours; I believe the Queen of England and country should like of it. By means of friends, therefore, you have sought your liberty, and satisfaction of your conscience, meaning that you promised me you could not leave me. If you think the danger great, do as you think best, and let me know what you please that I do; for I will ever be, for your sake, perpetual prisoner, or put my life in peril for your weal and mine. As you please, command me, for I will, for all the world, follow your commands, so that you be not in danger for me in so doing. I will, either if I were not by humble submission, and all my friends were against it, or by other ways, work for our liberties so long as I live. Let me know your mind, and whether you are not offended at me; for I fear you are, seeing that I do hear no news from you. I pray God preserve you, and keep us both from deceitful friends."[1]

Though professedly restricted to the despatch of open letters, Mary found means to send some that must have been closed. She forwarded letters into Scotland for her friends, and presents for her son. She wrote to the Bishop of Ross, complaining of her hard case, and enquiring if it were true that "a preacher of Lichfield" had preached against her by name, "in very outrageous and vile terms."

"At Coventry," she said, "some lewd preaching was made before my Lord Huntingdon; albeit it was told me it was meant to be me, I would not take it, because I know my innocency; but where I am named, except it be by some tolerance, I think it is too much."[2]

[1] *Strickland*, v. 1, p. 198. [2] *Labanoff*, v. 3, p. 17.

To the Archbishop of Glasgow Mary deplored her inability to send other than open letters; to Secretary Cecil she poured out some of her sweetest thanks. Towards Elizabeth, she was all submission, dreading removal into the hands of Murray; but with all this complaisance, she was full of plots and stratagems among her friends. At conspiracy, the Queen of Scots was an adept; at acting, a consummate performer; and she took care during her chequered life never to allow these gifts to rust for want of using.

In the midst of these numerous plottings, the Earl of Murray was assassinated in the streets of Linlithgow, by Hamilton of Bothwellhaugh, but his death brought no gain to Queen Mary's cause. Loss, rather than gain ensued, for the Bishop of Ross, her clever and most zealous ambassador, was arrested, by order of Elizabeth, and confined in the palace of the Bishop of London, in consequence of his suspicious and treasonable practices.

Shrewsbury, having provided well for the safety of his prisoner's body, determined also to have a care for her soul. His guards were everywhere. Though his allowance was not very regularly paid, and the linen sent from London was "almost worn out," he never relaxed his efforts, nor deprived the Queen of her proper attention; but care for her conversion was a refinement almost beyond his instructions. Perhaps it was from philanthropy; perhaps the reforming zeal had seized him; possibly his prisoner had delicately hinted at the prospect of her deriving good from the admonitions of a

heretic divine, for change of creed was one of the weapons Mary kept in her armoury for the alarm of friends lacking zeal in her cause, and for the deception of enemies, whom she hoped to beguile into concession. At all events, Shrewsbury resolved that she should have an improving opportunity during Lent. Writing on the 31st January, he says:—

"Considering the good order and exercise that was here the last Lent of preaching, I thought it convenient to desire the like at this time approaching. And therefore have I moved the Bishop of Coventry to preach here on Sunday next, by whose order and help I mean, verily, God willing, to have sermons twice in the week at least, before the Queen, unless in the meantime I shall perceive by your letters the Queen's Majesty's pleasure to be otherwise."[1]

The imprisonment of the Bishop of Ross touched Mary closely. All the threads of her complicated affairs were in his hands, and among his papers might be found matters compromising to herself. Both the Bishop and his mistress took high ground. Was he not an ambassador, and inviolate? How dare Elizabeth lay hands on him? Cecil knew with whom he was dealing, and the remonstrances were received very calmly. Entreaties were equally unavailing, until a new mood came over Elizabeth, and she was once more thinking of restoring the Queen of Scots. Meanwhile, the Bishop remained in durance, and his mistress transmitted to Court alternate protests and prayers for his release.

At the same time, plans of escape were ever being made and unmade. No sooner was one device pene-

[1] Shrewsbury to Cecil, Jan. 31.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. v., No. 5.

trated, than another was prepared. Shrewsbury was kept in a state of chronic uneasiness, his fears being aroused not so much by the prospect of attack from without, as by the dread of treachery within. Scarcely had six weeks elapsed since the return from Coventry, when in the middle of February, the establishment at Tutbury was alarmed by the discovery of one of these little plots. My lord had "a vehement suspicion." It seemed to him, "that the Queen's servants intended some special practice for her escape." The watchers and warders were at once augmented.

"He also caused the lock of her outer chamber door to be taken off, that her servants there, who were chiefly suspected, might be viewed any hour of the night, and the Queen herself sooner looked to, if any token of sudden change should chance."

Shrewsbury rated her soundly, using "very plain speech to her and her servants, to avoid any further practice." The Queen "showed herself very much offended," and remained "unquiet," but Shrewsbury was not to be turned from his purpose. He continued "wary and circumspect, without respect to any offence," and the unquiet lady had to digest her indignation as best she could.[1]

With all his care, Shrewsbury was conscious that communications, which he failed to reach, were going on. He tried every plan, but the Queen's agents evaded his guards, and passed and repassed her messages. In another house he thought, perhaps, he might succeed better. At least, a change was worth

[1] John Bateman to Cecil, Feb. 15th.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. v., No. 15. Bateman was Shrewsbury's Secretary. Most of the Earl's letters are in his hand.

the trial, the more so as the supply of water was growing very scarce, and impure, and the members of the household were suffering sickness therefrom. Fuel too was difficult to get, and the Castle was cold, damp, and comfortless. As Queen Elizabeth would not hear of Nottingham, he suggested Chatsworth as a suitable place to which to take his charge; but her Majesty, with her usual perversity, preferred Wingfield, and Shrewsbury prepared to return to that mansion.[1]

After her "practices," and "unquietness," Mary, us usual, fell sick. Writing to Cecil, on the 28th February, Shrewsbury says he has given the Queen's letters to the Queen of Scots—

"Who fell into a fever, on Saturday last, with pain of her head, and swelling of her hand, and since she hath remained not well thereof. To-day she prepared to answer the Queen's letter, and while writing fell into a fit of her fever, and caused her secretary to finish her letter."[2]

This sickness somewhat delayed the preparations for removal. A month later, namely, on the 29th March, Shrewsbury was still making arrangements to go to Wingfield, but at the same time urging Chatsworth in preference. His remonstrances were effectual. Leave was sent down to him to use his own discretion; and he did so, by at once deciding

[1] Shrewsbury to Cecil.—Urges the removal of the Queen, of which he wrote before. The water waxes evil, and scant. His servants fall ill daily thereby. The country is grieved with necessary carriages. If the Q. will not approve of Nottingham Castle, knows no place that he has as fit as Chatsworth, both for the strength of the house, and for avoiding acquaintance and practise for intelligence. Tutbury, 28 Feb. 1569. *Signed*, p. 1.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. v., No. 19.—Elizabeth to Shrewsbury, March 14, v. v., No. 22.

[2] Shrewsbury to Cecil, Feb. 28th.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. v., No. 18.

on Chatsworth; but the month of May was drawing to a close before the removal was effected.

In the interval, both Queens were as usual busy. Mary was stimulating the Duke of Norfolk, saying to him, "I will die and live with you. Your fortune shall be mine." To some Roman Catholic friend, she wrote, under the inspiration, perhaps of the Bishop of Coventry's Lent sermons, urging the necessity for sending aid to her friends in Scotland, "otherwise I will be forced to consent to dissemble soon to get my liberty, and embrace their religion."[1]

Elizabeth, who was still stamping out the sparks of rebellion in the north, was induced, owing to the shelter extended to some of the fugitives, to enter on an invasion of Scotland, in the course of which five hundred towns and villages were destroyed, and the whole Scottish border laid waste.[2] The circumstances of these barbarities were communicated to Mary by Shrewsbury, who writes a very unfeeling letter to Cecil, giving him an account of her reception of the intelligence.

"She finds herself much grieved, and thinks it shall appear unto the world she makes small account thereof. She hath begun this Monday, being the 8th of May, to exercise her long bow again, with her folks, with troubled mind as I think. She utters to me now that she is sorry that the Queen's majesty uses her subjects so, to spoil their coming under trust, as she terms it; and therefore she fears she shall receive small comfort at the Queen's Majesty's hands, but will hope that other princes will have care of her and her country. This is all she utters to me yet."[3]

[1] Shrewsbury to Cecil, March 29.—Shrewsbury to Elizabeth, April 10.—Mary to the Duke of Norfolk, 19th March, and 18th April.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. v., Nos. 23 and 25.—*Labanoff*, v. 3., p. 31.—*Strickland*, v. 1, p. 209.

[2] *Lodge*, v. 2. p. 42. [3] Shrewsbury to Cecil, May 11th.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 45.

One satisfaction Mary had in the midst of other disappointments. In the middle of May, the Bishop of Ross was set at liberty, and allowed to act once more in her behalf. Cecil wanted his assistance, for Elizabeth and her Council, undaunted by former failures and disappointments, were once again considering the possibility of coming to terms of accommodation with the captive. At a meeting of the Council, held at Hampton Court, on the 7th May, a sketch of a possible treaty was drawn up in Cecil's handwriting. Elizabeth was to be satisfied about Mary's pretensions to the English crown; the Prince of Scotland was to be brought into England; a league was to be concluded between the two kingdoms, guaranteed by the delivery of hostages of rank, and the surrender of the Castles of Dumbarton and Hume into the hands of Elizabeth. If Mary broke these conditions she was to forfeit her crown to her son, and be secluded from all titles to England. The Protestant religion was to be maintained in Scotland, and the party of the King of Scots continued in their state and offices.[1]

[1] The following is the Memorandum:—

"'*Renueyng*' [renouncing] of the Title. Provyding for the securite of the prince of Scotland, that he may be delyvered. That no straungers enter into Scotland. A leag betwixt England and Scotland. The rebells to be restored. Hostages of Scotland by the Queen's nomination—Er. Argile, L. Flemming, L. Harriss sonne. Castells to be delyvered (Dombrytton, Hume), for the Q.

"By parlementes in England and Scotland, ordered that if she breke these, to forfete hir title of Scotland to hir sonne, and to be secluded from all titles to England.

"Relligion to be mayntened in Scotland.

"The party for the Kyng of Scottes to be contynued in their states and offices.

"The party in Scotland to be aided with monny, so it past not jm li a month for v or vj monthes.

"The ennemyes of relligion reduced to obedience by execution of lawes.

"Monny to be amassed.

"The navy putt in redynes to serve uppon the seas. Garrisons to be layde uppon the frontyars to withstand incursions. If the French or Spanyards

To these terms Mary was asked to assent, but she did not like them. "She is very willing to have her Majesty's favour," explained Shrewsbury, "and harps upon one string still, that if she might come to her Majesty's presence she would utter such things to her, both for the weal of the realm and her own contentment, as she doubted not but such a knot of friendship would be tied thereby as should not be undone again, and she would do by her Majesty's advice and persuasion what she would not otherwise be brought unto. She thinks it a hard matter to yield her son in pledge, and her strongholds, and says that if the Queen has any doubt of her good meaning and plain dealing, she may be pledge herself till all things are performed."[1]

Mary conveys her own view of the position of affairs at this time in a letter to the Duke of Norfolk, dated May 17th, in which she says:—

"I have receyved, my owne good constant Lord, your comfortable writing, which are to me as welcome as ever thing was, for the hope I see you are in to have some better fortune nor you had yet, through all your frindes favour; and albeit my frindes case in Scotland be of hevy displeasure unto me, yet nothing to the feare I had of my sonnes delivery, and those

shall ayde them in Scotland that maynteene the Q. Rebells, to give them comefort as justice shall require.

"Hostages—

"Castells—

"*Endorsed.* 7 Maii, 1570, at Hampton Court.

"L. Mrq. (Winchester.)
"Er. Ar. (Arundel.)
"L. Leic. (Leicester.)
"Tresor. (of the household, Fr. Knollys.)
"Controll.
"Secretary. (Cecil.)
"Mr. Sadler."

In Cecil's hand throughout.—MSS. Mary Queen of Scots, v. v., No. 36.

[1] Shrewsbury to Cecil, May 24.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. v., No. 43, condensed.

that I thought might be cause of longer delaying your affayers. And therefore I toke greater displeasure nor I have donne sithence, and that disminisheth my helth a lytle, for the Earle of Shrewsbury came one night so mery to me, shewing that the Earle of Northumberland was rendred to the Earle of Sussex, which sithence I have found false, but at the sodeyne I toke sutche feare for frindes com bring me, that I wept so till I wall all swollen three dayes after, but sithence I have hard from you I have gonne abroad and sought all meanes to avoide displeasure for feare of yours, but I have nede to care for my helth, sithence thearle of Shrewsbury takes me to Chastwyth, and the Pestylence was in Rotheram, and in other places not farder nor Fulgeams next land. Thearle of Shrewsbury lokes for Bateman to be instructed how to deale wyth me bycause he is ablest and cleane turned from thearle of Leycester. This I assure you and pray you kepe yt quyeth. I have no longe laysure for I trust to write by one of my gentlemen shortly more surely, for I think to have more matter after Bateman's comming, but I feare at Chastwyth I will get lytle meanes to heare from you or to wryte, but I shall doe diligence and in this meane tyme I wryte to the byshop of Rosse to heare your opinion in the usage of the imbassadours to have their master's help and to followe yt. for comme what soe will, I shall never chaunge from you but during lyfe be true and obedyent as I have professed, and so I pray you think, and hold me in your grace as your owne whoe dayley shall pray to God to send you happy and hasty deliverance of all troubles, not doubting but you wold not then enjoy alone all your felicites, not remembring your owne faythfull to deathe, whoe shall not have any advancement or rest without you, and so I leave to trouble you but commend you to God at ΛΛ this xvijth day of May, your owne D."[1]

Two days before this letter was written, the Pope's Bull of Excommunication against Elizabeth

[1] *Copy.—Harl. MSS.*, 290, fol. 87.—This letter is printed by Prince Labanoff, v. 3, p. 47, but there are some remarkable omissions in his version, though the reference to the Harleian MSS. is the same. I have in this instance followed the original spelling.

had been fulminated. The circumstance troubled the Queen, and made her suspicious of the attitude of the Catholic powers abroad, and of her Catholic subjects at home. She was not quite sure of the effect the Pope's action might have, and could scarcely persuade herself that a proceeding, once so terrible, was now so harmless.

In his letter of May 24th, the Earl of Shrewsbury added, by way of postscript, that he intended to remove the Queen of Scots that day to Chatsworth. Chatsworth, now the world-famed seat of the Duke of Devonshire, was then the property of the Countess of Shrewsbury. Her second husband, Sir William Cavendish, had purchased the estate from the ancient Derbyshire family of Agard, who, however, had only acquired this property in 1550, from Francis Leche. The old house of the Leche's was pulled down, and Cavendish began to build what Camden calls "a spacious and elegant house," in the form of a quadrangle, with four turrets at the four corners. The work was not finished when Sir William Cavendish died in 1557, but his widow was quite at home in building operations, and carried the undertaking to completion, with considerable satisfaction to herself. A picture of this house, which was pulled down by the first Duke of Devonshire, in the latter years of the seventeenth century, to give place to the present mansion, now hangs in one of the galleries at Chatsworth,—a picture that thousands of visitors see, and few examine. It was to this house that the Earl of Shrewsbury brought his captive-guest, on the 24th or 25th May, 1570. There, on the

pleasant banks of the Derwent, she passed a busy, anxious summer and autumn. How well she must have known that landscape! The background of wooded hill, the green pastures of the park, lighted up by the flashes of the river, and in the distance, the bare hill sides of Longstone-edge. Northwards, lay the brown moorland, with its rugged millstone crags, stretching away towards Sheffield. From her moated bower in the Park, which we have already mentioned, the Queen of Scots might take the air when horse exercise was impossible, and gaze upon the lovely vale within its circling hills.

Early in June, the Bishop of Ross was permitted to visit his mistress at her new abode. It was long since they had met, and both had gone through stirring scenes. Leslie was devoted to his Queen, and Mary well knew how to show her appreciation of faithful service. There was much about which to commune with him, on events past and future, the hardships of their two imprisonments, the prospects of the expected treaty, the Norfolk marriage, and the still fondly anticipated restoration to place and power. The Duke of Norfolk, from his prison in the Tower, was protesting to Elizabeth his determination to think no more of the Queen of Scots; but Mary, still clinging to the hope that he and his friends might do someting effectual in her interest, was plying him with sweetest words. The arrival of the Bishop of Ross enabled the Queen to see more clearly than she had hitherto done, the bearings of her position. Up to that time she had pleased herself with the thought that

Elizabeth would be obliged to restore her; now she concluded it would be best not to count too confidently on forcing Elizabeth's hand. Cecil's terms had seemed hard. Leslie thought they should be accepted with eagerness, in the firm assurance that once at liberty she might laugh at conditions, and take her own course. By the safe hand of the Bishop, Mary wrote, on the 14th June, to the Duke of Norfolk, to whom she declared her constancy; to Elizabeth, whom she assured of her determination to follow strictly that course which was agreeable to her, and no other; to Charles IX., her brother-in-law, asking him to urge the conclusion of the treaty, or in default, to send an army into Scotland. She wrote also to Catherine de Medici, her mother-in-law, and to the French Ambassador, M. de la Mothe. On the 18th, she wrote to Cecil, begging his assistance towards giving her a more perfect intelligence, and friendship, with the Queen of England, and thanking him for allowing her to confer with the Bishop of Ross.

To the Bishop, she spoke her mind fully on all points. He knew what to say to Norfolk, and what to say to the ministers; and besides his verbal instructions, he had written ones to convey to his Holiness the Pope. Mary wrote of the strictness of her captivity, of the intrigues of her enemies to get her out of the custody of the Earl of Shrewsbury, and into the charge of the Earls of Bedford, of Hertford, or of Huntingdon, where she would feel like a lamb in the care of wolves. She spoke of her ardent desire to re-establish the Catholic religion

in the whole of Britain, and asked for a declaration of the nullity of her marriage with Bothwell. She besought the Pope to use his influence with the princes of Christendom to induce them to make application to Elizabeth for her better treatment, saying that her English friends anticipated much good from this course.[1]

With his wallet full of letters, and his head full of plots, the Bishop of Ross returned to London, and solicited an audience of the Queen. To Cecil he communicated the information that his mistress was most anxious to please the Queen of England. "After so many storms, her wish was to live in quietness;" and for his own part, the Bishop would count himself most happy if he could unite their majesties in heart, mind, and bonds indissoluble.[2]

Mary still hesitated, or made a show of hesitating, about the removal of her son into England, and she even wrote to the Countess of Lennox, her mother-in-law, from whom she had been alienated since the murder of Darnley, begging for her advice.

The treatment of the Queen of Scots at this period of her captivity, appears to have been marked by those fitful changes between leniency and rigour that characterized so many years of its course. Stories reached Elizabeth, through the mouths of her spies, of the indulgence shown by the Earl of Shrewsbury, and he was forthwith admonished.[3]

[1] *Labanoff*, v. 3, p. 57.

[2] Ross to Cecil, June 26.—*MSS. Mary Queen o Scots*, v. v., No. 51.

[3] The following document, printed in Haynes's State Papers, pp. 606-7, though bearing no date, is probably the letter at this time addressed to

On the 26th July, Shrewsbury explained in letters, both to Cecil and Queen Elizabeth, that there had been no resort or conference with the Queen of Scots, without her Majesty's license, and there had been no repair to him upon any colour inconvenient, but for more surety he gave orders that his friends should forbear coming upon any cause. He declares he cannot prevent repair to her servants, and the receipt of letters and intelligence by them, unless he keeps them prisoners. Already, the order he keeps is a great deal too straight, but however hardly it is taken, he will not omit any part of his duty.[1]

Shrewsbury. His letter of July 26th, at least, meets the chief points objected to :—

"Minute of the Queen's Majestie's Letter to Therl of Shrewsbury. By the Queen.

"Right trusty and welbeloved cousin, we greet you well. We be given to understand by credible means, that (now whilst the Ministers and Friends of the Scottish Queen seek to deal with us and make intreaty for her further enlargement), certain other persons dwelling about those parts, both of right good havior and of meaner sort, whereof some have heretofore been toward you (though presently they be not) do intend, if possibly they can, to work some secret practice for the escape and conveyance away of the said Queen. And albeit we nothing mistrust your fidelity toward us, nor do any ways doubt of your circumspection in the substantial looking to this charge committed unto you, specially being of such importance as you know it is: yet have we thought necessary both to let you understand what is brought to our knowledge, and to require you also earnestly to have the rather of this respect, a careful and vigilant eye in the substantial looking to the said Queen's safe and sure keeping. Wherein we are to put you in remembrance, that, although she be restrained from some part of the late liberty which she had in going abroad to Hawk and Hunt, yet shall that serve to small purpose, as long as the gentlemen and others about that country shall be permitted to have daily access unto her in such liberal sort, as presently they have, whereunto good regard would be had, and some convenient reformation used therein in such wise, as you shall think may serve best for the avoiding of all inconveniences that might be attempted. And in case you shall think that you cannot safely keep her in that place, where she now remaineth, we then put it to your choice to bring her unto Tutbury, if you shall find it so necessary; wherein nevertheless good consideration and regard would be had, so to order the matter, that no manner of show be made unto any body of your intention to remove her, until the very time you do put the same in execution, lest by the foreknowledge thereof some evil disposed persons might take occasion to work some practice for her escape; for the avoiding whereof you shall do well to use as much circumspection as you can, and yourself to go as strongly accompanied with your own folks, as you shall think necessary."

[1] Shrewsbury to Cecil, July 26th.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. v., No. 55.

In confirmation of these assurances we find the Bishop of Ross complaining at this time "that his mistress was not permitted to take the air abroad."

The protestations of Lord Shrewsbury and the remonstrances of the Bishop appear to have satisfied Elizabeth for the moment, and she wrote on the 4th August to Shrewsbury, "that in the Earl's company the Queen of Scots might ride and take the air for her health."[1]

Charles IX., in the interest of his sister, accredited as special envoy to Elizabeth, M. de Poigny, gentleman in ordinary of his bed-chamber, to express his ardent desire that the negotiations for her liberty might be concluded satisfactorily. After visiting London, M. de Poigny was to repair to the Queen of Scots, and then go forward into Scotland, where he would converse with the Prince and the nobles, urging them to live in perfect unity with each other,

[1] The Queen's Majesty to Therle of Shrewsbury, Aug. 4th, 1570.
We greet you well. When the Bishop of Ross, being yesterday with us, seemeth to lament that the Queen of Scots is not by you permitted to take the air abroad; although we cannot find any fault with you, for a due regard to her being in your charge; yet we are content, that in your company she may ride and take the air for her health. Wherein we would also be more ready to satisfy all requests made for more license for her liberty there, but that we have frequent advertisements of attempts devised for to abuse us, and to convey her away, by colour of her riding abroad in hunting: Wherein beside the dishonour to us, we know you can consider how much it should touch you, considering the singular trust reposed in you; and therefore so as such peril be prevented by your circumspection, we are very pleased, that she be permitted to have any liberty to take the air, being convenient for her health. We are also content that you shall suffer one Thomas Levynston or George Robynson, whom that Queen shall name, to repair with her letters to the Lord Harrys or Lord Levynston, by way of the west borders; for which purpose you may give on them your letter to the Lord Scroope our Warden there for his safe passage and return. And you may well say to that Queen, that the delays that are used in her cause groweth merely by the sinister arts of her subjects, that make profession to obey her, who, notwithstanding the appointment made by us with the Bishop of Ross for the entering to the order of her cause, have lately made new invasions into our Realm, and, as we hear, do maintain openly some of the principal of our rebels upon the West Borders; which surely we can not suffer, being done in contempt of us, and consequently can not but hinder her cause; whereof we have largely made mention to the Bishop of Ross, who we think will thereof advertise her.—*Haynes*, p. 601.

and to render to the Queen, their natural princess and sovereign, the obedience and fidelity they owe to her.[1] M. de Poigny's instructions were dated the 19th June, but on presenting himself in London he found some difficulty in carrying out his orders. Permission to go into Scotland was positively refused, and only with difficulty did he obtain leave to repair to Chatsworth.

In his letter to Cecil of July 26th, from which we have already quoted, Shrewsbury refers to the visit to this envoy to his charge. He says the French gentleman bestowed all his time in private conference with the Queen, and this would have continued a whole week, but as they perceived the Earl was not inclined thereto, "they made no further motion, but passed all their doings in quiet manner, without any vaunt or notice given of the cause of his coming."[2]

The departure of M. de Poigny was made use of by Mary, as the departure of the Bishop of Ross had been five or six weeks before, to forward a packet of letters to her relatives in France, thanking them for their remembrance, and soliciting further assistance. The treaty was the burden of her theme. That the treaty might be brought to a speedy conclusion was all her desire, for the Bishop of Ross had fully satisfied her of the wisdom of his policy, and brought her to a condition of willingness to accept Elizabeth's terms whatever they might prove to be.

[1] *Strickland*, v. 1, p. 221.

[2] Shrewsbury to Cecil, July 26th.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. v., No. 55.

The conditions asked for were the confirmation of the treaty made at Edinburgh, July 1560, and especially of that clause of it renouncing Mary's pretensions to the English crown, during the life of Elizabeth or her issue. She asked for an alliance, offensive and defensive; for the delivery of the Earl of Northumberland and other rebels in Scotland; for redress to those English subjects suffering from the inroads of the men of Teviotdale; and for the punishment of the murderers of Darnley and Murray. The ninth clause related to the removal of Prince James into England, and was as follows:—

"For the young king's surety from his enemies, who murdered his father, the Queen, before she is put at liberty, shall cause him to be brought to England, to live under the government of Scotch lords and gentlemen named by his grandfather, Lennox, and Marr, now his governor, *or by either of them, with the Q. Majesty's consent.* He shall continue in England as long as the Q. of England please. She shall bind herself that he shall be treated *as her nearest kinsman.* His mother may send at all times to visit him, but the messengers must come by the wardens of England, and have their passports. When the Q. of Scots dies, *or whenever, he being of mature years, she is content to remit her government to him*, he shall be immediately restored to Scotland, and established in his kingdom by the help of the Q. of England, in such freedom as if he had never come into England."[1]

Elizabeth further asked that the Queen of Scots should not marry without her consent, or the consent of the majority of the Scotch nobility; should disavow the pretence of a marriage between herself and the Duke of Anjou; and should allow none of her subjects to go into Ireland without a safe conduct from the Queen of England.

[1] The words in Italics are corrections in Cecil's hand.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. v., No. 77.

As security for the fulfilment of these conditions, Elizabeth asked for six Scotch hostages, three being Earls, and three Lords of Parliament, or Provosts of Burghs, who were to remain in England three years. Lest Mary should seek to free herself from her engagements under the plea of compulsion, it was arranged, that, having been set at liberty, and having declared on oath that she would not leave the kingdom without the Queen's licence, she was to execute a new instrument declaring herself at liberty, and confirming the articles under the great seal of Scotland. If Mary attempted anything derogatory to Elizabeth's title, or aided any body in doing so, she should be declared, *ipso facto*, to have forfeited all title to the English succession. The treaty was to be confirmed by the Scotch parliament. Hume Castle was to remain in the hands of the English till the rebels there were delivered, and for three years England might hold any fortress Elizabeth named in Galloway or Kantire.[1]

On these conditions Elizabeth was ready to part with her troublesome guest, and the negotiations went slowly on. The Countess of Lennox earnestly remonstrated with Cecil against the project of sending Mary back into Scotland. Chatelherault, Argyll, and Huntly, prayed her to restore the captive to her country and her authority; while at the same time they were writing to the Duke of Alva, begging him to invade the realm. Upon Maitland of Lethington devolved the task of shaping Mary's conduct, and it was his advice she followed. Maitland's policy

[1] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. v., No. 77.

is disclosed in a letter to the Bishop of Ross, dated Blair Athol, August 15. On the 4th of August, the Duke of Norfolk had been liberated from the Tower, and allowed to reside, under some restraint, in his own house. This, said Maitland, "is the best news I have heard this twelve months." Nothing could have pleased him better, except the Queen of Scots' restitution, or the departure of the Queen of England, *ad patres*. As regards the treaty, he counsels acceptance. It may be hard for Mary to deliver her son in England, and give hostages, yet for the sake of her liberty he would not stick at them. Besides, if she were once at liberty, means might be found to make both England and Scotland loth to enterprise far against her. He would make the best terms he could, but for the sake of liberty, accept even the worst. "Yield as little as ye may, but yield to all rather than she remain a prisoner." As regards projects a-foot for her escape, he adds:—

"Ye touch in your letter, that in your former letter, which I have not yet received, ye write [of] a secret purpose touching the Q. of Scots' escape. I pray you beware with that point, for albeit I would be content to be banished Scotland all the days of my life to have the Q. of S. obtain liberty without the Q. of England's consent, for the great uncourtesy that she has used unto her, rather than have it with her consent, and I the best Earldom in Scotland between hands, because I would she might be even with the Q. of England, yet I dare not advise her majesty to press at it, without she be well assured there be no kind of danger in the executing of her enterprise; for I fear deadly the craft of her enemies, that will not stick to set out some themselves to make her majesty offers to convey her away, and let her see probability, to give her courage to take it in hand, and then they, being privy to it, to trap her in a

snare, and so to execute against her person their wicked intention, which now for shame of the world and fear of other princes they dare not do, she being in their own hands. I know not what the purpose is. This I write upon the little touch your letter bears. So soon as I shall receive the other letter, I shall answer it amply. Save her life whatever ye do, and, sure I am, God, with time, shall bring all other things to pass to our contentment, but that point lost can never be recovered, and then all is gone."[1]

In the spirit of this remarkable letter Mary carried on her negotiations about the treaty. The progress was watched with dread, almost with dismay, by the opponents of the Queen of Scotland. Lennox remonstrated more than once, both as regent, and as the father of the murdered Darnley, and the Countess of Lennox declared, on the authority of her lord, that great perils and dangers would certainly happen in Scotland if that realm should get to know of the "parlementyng" with the Queen of Scots.[2]

Shrewsbury, meanwhile, was as watchful as ever, keeping Cecil well informed of his proceedings to prevent any secret practices; for the friends of the Scottish Queen, having more zeal than discretion, were falling into those very dangers from which the sagacity of Maitland saw the desirability of keeping them. The Queen's admirers could not help plotting for her liberation, and all their plots were betrayed to Cecil. Two sons of the Earl of Derby, along with a gentleman named John Hall or Herlle, had a project in hand to carry Mary off from one of

[1] Lethington to Ross, August 15.—Contemporary decipher, but rendered above into modern English.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. v., No. 64.

[2] Countess of Lennox to Cecil, September 21.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. v., No. 73.

the windows at Chatsworth; but one, Rolston, a gentleman pensioner and son to one of the conspirators, betrayed the plot. All were seized except Hall, who made good his escape to the Isle of Man, and thence to Dumbarton, where on the capture of that stronghold by Crawford, of Jordanhill, on the 2nd April, 1571, he was taken, and afterwards executed in London. The Bishop of Ross actively pressed the negotiations forward, communicating the views of the Scottish Queen to Elizabeth, and finally, brought matters to such a state of forwardness, that the Queen of England resolved to send no less an envoy to her captive than Sir William Cecil himself, accompanied by Sir Walter Mildmay, Chancellor of the Exchequer. This intention was conveyed to Mary by Queen Elizabeth, in a letter of more than ordinary bluntness. The letter is long, but it may be thus abstracted:—

"If it were not unnecessary to excuse my long silence, a reason could be given only too easily, although in doing this I should have to enter on the uncongenial task of dwelling on my own acts of kindness, and your ungrateful return for them. You owed the preservation of your life, in circumstances of the greatest danger, to me, and have requited the obligation by stirring up treason among the servants of your benefactress. I seem to hear you say that you never thought of treating me so, but that all you did was without any purpose of harming me. If there were any room for admitting the plea of want of intelligence, or that of ignorance, or of evil nurture, I would only too gladly acknowledge them, but these all failing, the only means of effacing the memory of the past lies in the hope of amendment in your conduct for the future. I am willing to hope you are desirous of thus blotting out the past, and therefore accede to the request to send two faithful counsellors in the hope of coming to some terms of agreement. Treat with

them with the same confidence as with myself. Do not think that the insolent threats of my good brother the King of France have had anything to do with inducing me to listen to your proposals. I could laugh in my sleeve to think that any one should know me so ill as to fancy that fear would lead me to take any other path than that which honour commands. You ask to communicate with me privately, but I do not think proper to grant your request for a meeting. If you will either make known those secret matters through my secretary, or inform him of them, you may depend on strict secrecy. If you accept neither of these courses, I shall be obliged to conclude this passage in your letter was not written in good faith. I pray God to give you grace to afford me just cause for blotting out your past offences against me, and that I may never again be reminded of them by any conduct of yours. Such a result would be most pleasing to me, God knows.[1]

In September the formal commission was made out, and at the commencement of October the two ministers, accompanied by the Bishop of Ross, set forth to Chatsworth. Elizabeth was a little fearful of the effect Mary's charms of person and manner might have upon Cecil, and gave him a word of caution to be on his guard. The Countess of Lennox too wrote him, while on his mission, adding her admonition to that of the Queen:—

"Not for any fear you should be won, which as her Majesty tells me, she did speak to you at your departing, but to let you understand how her Majesty hath had some talks with me touching my lord. . . . Her Majesty says that Queen works many ways. I answered, her Majesty was a good lady to her, and better, I thought, than any other prince would have been, if they were in her case, for she had staid publishing abroad her wickedness, which was manifestly known."[2]

[1] Mr. Froude gives a clever and picturesque abridgement of this letter, v. 10, p. 103. The whole may be seen in *Teulet*, v. 2, pp. 406-8.

[2] Countess of Lennox to Cecil, Oct. 5.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. v., No. 83.

It would be interesting to know more than we do of the details of the conference between Queen Mary and Cecil. The careful Secretary has left no record of his impressions on seeing the Queen of Scots, but both he and that lady flattered themselves, after the interviews were over, that their charms had not been thrown away. Mary put forth all her arts and graces, and the Secretary wore his smoothest exterior. Shrewsbury played his part in sumptuous and hospitable entertainment. The articles of the treaty, and the proposed sureties, were gone through item by item, and Mary noted her objections and suggested alterations. That was all that could be done, pending the appointment of Commissioners from Scotland to represent the Government of the King, and on the 24th October Cecil and his companion returned to Windsor.

Before their departure Mary wrote to Queen Elizabeth, expressing her agreement to the proposals that had been made, and begging for a personal interview;[1] but a letter from the Bishop of Ross, dated Chatsworth, 11th October, throws more light on what was going on. It is headed, "The Bishop of Ross to Duke of Norfolk," and is similarly endorsed by Cecil, though Norfolk is always spoken of in the third person. The Bishop says:—

"Since writing last by Goodyeare's boy, the Q. of Scots has dealt privily with Cecil, so that he will be her friend. He likes well of her nature, and has confirmed his opinion that Lyddington's saying to him was true, which was that she was of clement and gentle nature, and was disposed to be governed by council of them in whom she reposed her trust.

[1] *Labanoff*, v. 3, p. 106.

He promises to obtain an interview between the Queens, and has advised Q. Mary as to her behaviour in such case, to win the Q. of England's favour. In conference upon the articles touching the subjects, wherein Cecil and Mildmay showed themselves gentle enough for the present, they received as answer from Court that this Tuesday, the Q. of England had sent for Leicester, and would advise with him, and send an answer, which they expect on Friday at latest. They will then depart. We hope the Secretary will bring this matter to some good conclusion. Sends a letter from the Q. of Scots. They have spoken with the Bishop concerning her marriage with the Earl of Angus. Has told them plainly that she will not marry a Scot. Cecil told him secretly that he could like well of the Duke of Norfolk marrying, but now is not the time to speak of it. He says the Q. would fear that he and Q. Mary would wax over great, but he thinks that the surety which Q. Mary makes to Q. Elizabeth shall put away this fear, and so the matter may be followed.

"Thinks he may be made to labour for that marriage, if Norfolk do cause employ him. Meantime will deal with him, as of himself, to knit the knot of sure friendship between Norfolk and the Secretary, 'for he shows himself very plain to me in many things.'" [1]

Writing from Windsor on the 26th October, 1570, Cecil communicated to Shrewsbury as follows:—

"May it please your honourable good Lord (after my due humble commendations remembered to your Lordship, and my good Lady), to understand that we two, your Lordship's troublesome guests, arrived here safely at the Court on Saturday, in the afternoon, and have imparted to her Majesty our proceedings with that Queen, wherein our labours are not misliked by her Majesty; and yet some exceptions are taken to two or three of the last answers made by the Queen of Scots, wherein I think there will prove no such difficulty but that the Queen of Scots will satisfy the Queen's Majesty; so as the whole now shall

[1] Ross to Norfolk, Oct. 11.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. v., No. 84.

rest upon some good determination of the rest at the coming of the commissioners from Scotland on both parts.

"We have, as in duty we are bound, made report to her Majesty of your Lordship's careful, discreet, and chargeable service in the charge of that Queen, for her surety, and for the Queen's Majesty's honour. We have also fully satisfied her Majesty with the painful and trusty behaviour of my Lady your wife, in giving good regard to the surety of the said Queen; wherein her Majesty surely seemed to us to be very glad, and used many good words, both of your Lordship's fidelity towards herself, and of the love that she thought my Lady did bear to her. We also besought her Majesty that your Lordship might receive her thanks for your chargeable and loving entertainment of us, which I trust she will cause to be known to your Lordship.

"Now for the removing of that Queen, her Majesty said at first that she trusted so to make an end in short time that your Lordship should be shortly acquitted of her; nevertheless, when I told her Majesty that you could not long endure your household there, for lack of fuel and other things, and that I thought Tutbury not so fit a place as it was supposed, but that Sheffield was the metest, her Majesty said she would think of it, and within a few days give me knowledge. Only I see her Majesty lothe to have that Queen to be often removed, supposing that thereby she cometh to new acquaintance; but to that I said your Lordship could remove her without calling any to you but your own. Upon motion made by me at the Bishop of Ross's request, the Queen's Majesty is pleased that your Lordship shall, when you see times meet, suffer that Queen to take the air about your house on horseback, so your Lordship be in company; and therein I am sure your Lordship will have good respect to your own company, to be sure and trusty; and not to pass from your house above one or two miles, except it be on the moors; for I never fear any other practice of strangers, as long as there be no corruption amongst your own. And thus I humbly take my leave of your Lordship and my Lady, to whom my wife hath written to give her thanks for certain tokens,

whereof I understood nothing before she told me of them; and sorry I am my Lady should have bestowed such things as my wife cannot recompense as she would, but with her hearty good will and service, which shall always be ready to her favour and mine also; assuring yourself that to my uttermost I will be to your Lordship and to my Lady as sure in good will as any poor friend you have." [1]

The Scotch commissioners were named shortly afterwards, but Elizabeth had grown cold in her zeal for the restoration of the Queen of Scots, and the treaty made no further progress.

A circumstance occurred at Chatsworth, in the midst of the negotiations, which Mary felt rather keenly. One of her old and faithful servants, John Beaton, master of the household, nephew to Cardinal Beaton, and brother to the Archbishop of Glasgow, Mary's Ambassador in Paris, died. With her habitual consideration for those who served her, Mary did not allow this intelligence to be communicated to the Archbishop of Glasgow by any hand but her own. Though she was suffering from inflammation of the eye, the result of a severe cold, she wrote him a long letter of condolence, expressing her deep sorrow for the loss of his brother, "the only minister whom I selected to comfort and counsel me in this my long affliction and banishment from among my good servants and friends." [2]

Beaton was interred at Edensor, near Chatsworth, where a brass plate to his memory may still be seen, the inscription on which has been many times printed.

After the disappointment of those hopes of liberation which the treaty had raised, Mary's health gave

[1] *Lodge*, v. 2, pp. 49-51. [2] *Strickland*, v. 1, p. 226.

way. She saw that Elizabeth had ceased to take an interest in the negotiation, and, perhaps, thought to stimulate her by exciting fears about her captive's life. Towards the end of November, Mary wrote despairingly to the Bishop of Ross, saying that Elizabeth intended to do nothing for her profit;[1] and this communication she followed up three days afterwards with a letter complaining that the Earl of Lennox was selling her jewels, and that the people about her son were writing to him "filthy and most dishonest words" about his mother.[2]

Elizabeth meanwhile had been considering Cecil's suggestion that the Queen should be removed to Sheffield, and had decided that it should be done. The change, Mary hoped, would do her good. On the 26th November, she wrote to La Mothe, saying that she found herself a little unwell, but hoped that if it was nothing but change of air that she wanted, as she was going to another house of the Earl of Shrewsbury's, she should find herself better.[3]

On the 27th, she wrote of her condition more fully to the Bishop of Ross, saying:—

"It is of truth we are not in good health, nor have not been two days together since your departing herefrom. For notwithstanding the accustomed dolour of our side, there is a rheum that troubles our head gritumlie with an extreme pain and descends in the stomach, so that it makes us wholly to lack appetite of eating. Our physician, we believe, describes to you the manner of our malady more amply, and the bearer will show you what he has seen thereof. Yesterday, thinking the air should have done us good, we walked forth a little on horse-

[1] Mary to Ross, 27 Nov.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. v., No. 89.
[2] *Labanoff*, v. 3, p. 124. [3] *Labanoff*, v. 3, p. 128.

back, and so long as we were abroad, felt ourself in a very good state, but yet since find our sickness nothing slacked. My Lord of Shrewsbury, because he and others have opinion the changing of air shall make us convalesce, is deliberate to transport us tomorrow to Sheffield, where if our malady continues or waxes anything rather to the worse than the better (as we hope to God it shall not) we will not omit to advertise you with diligence. Give thanks in our name to the Queen, our good sister, for her offers, and show her that herself may, as we trust she will, be the best physician to us under God, and that in fulfilling our most reasonable and continual requests made to her since our coming in this her realm, with that also we desired by our former and late letters to be accomplished."[1]

[1] *Labanoff*, v. 3, p. 130.

CHAPTER VI.

WE may perhaps call in the imagination to assist in bringing before the mind the scene presented on that November morning, when the Queen of Scots and her attendants left Chatsworth, for their twelve miles ride to Sheffield. The retinue was ample, and was wholly composed of the retainers of the Earl of Shrewsbury. No strangers were there, and every man had been carefully chosen for known fidelity to his lord. It was not as on the occasion of the removal from Bolton, when horses had to be borrowed from the Bishop of Durham. The Queen had her own stud, and the horses of the Earl were adequate for any emergency. For some days before the removal of the captive, pack-horses, and the little rough carts of Derbyshire, had been passing between Chatsworth and Sheffield, with the needful luggage and stores. The Queen's effects took a great deal of removing, and as the task fell on those who were bound to do service for the Earl, the whole country side felt the burden. But what could Lord Shrewsbury do? He was more grievously imposed upon than any of his tenants. If they had to give the occasional use of their carts, he had to give up a mansion, his personal freedom, the society of friends,

and very large sums of money, beyond his allowance, in serving his sovereign. The people complained, and so did the Earl, but both lived in hope that deliverance was not far off.

The 28th November may have been a gloomy day or a bright one. Gloom is the more frequent aspect of that time of the year, and certainly gloom must have harmonized with the feelings of the travellers. The hopes of the Queen of Scots were low. The promised treaty was slipping from her grasp, and sickness lay on her sore. Lord Shrewsbury was growing very tired of his anxious and thankless charge. The incessant watching wore his health. The unreasonable suspicions of Elizabeth, and her ever recurring complaints, wearied him; and the only circumstance in the removal that shed a little light across his path, was, that he was moving to his favourite residence, and his strongest house, at Sheffield.

May we look at the cavalcade as it starts from the court-yard at Chatsworth? The Queen rides well, and despite the old grief at her side, and her present sickness, she almost dares to smile at the prospect of the exhilarating movement in the fresh air. Horse exercise always does her good, and springing lightly to the saddle she fancies herself already somewhat better. The Earl, ever near her, reins his horse to her side, and before them, and behind, are the attendants and guards. The faithful Lady Livingstone was there, Mistress Bruce and Mistress Seaton. Rollett, the Queen's secretary, was near at hand, but his friend, John Beaton, lay

under the quiet church at Edensor, and his place, as Master of the Household, was held by his brother, who had not yet arrived from Paris, whence he was coming to discharge his new duties. Two of the late Master Beaton's servants, Archibald Beaton and Thomas Archibald, had been taken by the Queen into her service, and their names appear in the list of her attendants at this time. Master Castel was her physician in close attendance, Bastian was the page, Martin Huet the cook, and these, with some twenty others, formed her retinue. Slowly and carefully the horses picked their way along the stony moorland roads, and occasionally on a sandy piece of table-land they were able to indulge in a canter, disturbing the moor game that rose with an alarmed whirr. The bold crags of millstone grit frowned then, as now, over Curbar. The great block called the Eagle stone was passed to the right of the road, while all around lay boulders of millstone-grit, and beyond were rugged cliffs of the same rock. As the train neared Sheffield, the scenery became less wild. Woods took the place of heather, and cultivated fields succeeded rush-bearing marshes. Shrewbury's mansion on the hill, called Sheffield Lodge, was descried full seven miles away, from the ridge above Totley, and Mary then gained her first sight of the town that was to be for so many years, her home.

The ride was not a long one. Making every allowance for slow progress, three hours and a-half would see the royal party from the gates of Chatsworth to the drawbridge at Sheffield. The day that

brought to the town the heiress presumptive to the crown ought to have been a high one in Sheffield; but it was not. A jealous Queen had forbidden any resort of strangers where Mary of Scotland was, and a loyal Earl had given to her commands most stringent effect. The little town, if left to its own devices, would have been all eager to catch a glimpse of the celebrated prisoner. But unfortunately for the gratification of the people's curiosity, the expected arrival had been kept a great secret, and when, on the appearance of the cavalcade, concealment was no longer possible, a peremptory message from the Earl may have sent idlers to their homes. Over the drawbridge heavy hoofs clattered, and the gates were shut. Let us picture to ourselves Lord Shrewsbury, in riding coat and boots, conducting the Queen to her apartments, after assisting her to dismount in the inner court yard. There is an appearance of melancholy on his grave, thin face, as with stately courtesy he leads the way across the hall and up the stairs. In the presence of royalty, even though it be captive royalty, he stands uncovered, and we see to advantage the Lord of Hallamshire, in the castle of his ancestors.

The Castle of Sheffield stood on the gently rising ground at the confluence of the rivers Sheaf and Dun, and covered an area of more than four acres. But little is known of its plan and appearance. No drawing of it is believed to exist, and every trace of the building has long since disappeared under the utilitarian demands of a manufacturing town. Furnaces for making steel, cutlers' shops, forges, stables,

cottages, and even killing shambles, now stand upon its site; and only in the names of a few adjoining streets, do we catch, as it were, an echo of the former existence of a castle. In the year 1637, the Earl of Arundel, then Lord of the Manor, employed one John Harrison to make a careful survey of the estate; but Harrison looked not with the eye of a lover of the picturesque. He tells us very accurately the quantities of the land, the size of the timber, the stores of mineral and animal wealth on the estate, but nothing of the appearance, shape, fittings or arrangement of the Castle. He does not mention the apartments of the Queen of Scots, though there were probably persons then living who remembered her sojourn there.[1]

At the time of which we write the old grey walls of Sheffield Castle were in thorough repair, and their solidity and admirable situation made the place an important stronghold. On its north side the broad river Dun, containing, as Harrison says, "great store of salmons, trouts, chevins, eels, and other small fish," formed its water defence; on the east, the Sheaf or Sheath flowed under the walls, while on the south and west a wide foss had been cut. Looked at in the light of modern changes we may

[1] Mr. Hunter, in a paper read before the Society of Antiquaries in 1846, remarks upon the fate of the houses of the Earl and Countess of Shrewsbury connected with the history of Mary. He says:—"The Castle of Sheffield was sleighted after the civil wars, and has been removed, piece by piece, till nothing remains of it. Sheffield Manor still exists a ruin of great extent. Worksop Manor was burned down in 1761. Wingfield Manor, a house of the reign of Henry VI., was abandoned by the family to the steward, and in his hands and those of his descendants it has been reduced to the condition of a picturesque ruin. Tutbury is also in ruins. The house at Chatsworth, which received the Queen, has been removed and replaced by the present magnificent fabric."

say that the castle walls enclosed the space from the two rivers to the Lady's bridge and Waingate on the one side, and probably to Dixon lane on the other. A castle had stood on this site from a very remote period; indeed it is not unlikely there may have been here a small Roman station, on the line of road from Templeborough by Rotherham, to Brough, in the Peak of Derbyshire. There was a castle at Sheffield in the days of the Lovetots and the Furnivals, predecessors of the Talbots, as owners of this Manor and Lordship. The castle of the Talbots was, as Harrison tells us, fairly built with stone and very spacious, containing divers buildings and lodgings about an inward courtyard; while to the south there was an outward court or fould, built round with various houses of office, as an armoury, a granary, barns, stables, and lodgings. The entrance was on the south side, by a drawbridge across the ditch. We may fairly picture to ourselves the apartments of the Earl, his family, and immediate attendants, surrounding the inner court, while the outward court was a kind of stable-yard, partly taken up with the lodgings of servants. Tradition, which has preserved so little of the history of this Castle, has naturally lost all memory of the situation and character of the apartments assigned to the Queen. That she would be well lodged we cannot doubt, but whether the Castle was capable of lodging her handsomely we do not know. The rooms were not improbably cold, gloomly and comfortless. Built for strength and not for ornament, Norman castles made but sorry mansions, and that at Sheffield was

not more attractive than any of its contemporaries.[1] It was at the Lodge or Manor house in the Park that Mary occasionally enjoyed such luxuries as Sheffield could afford.

Nearly opposite the Castle, across the rivers Sheaf and the Dun, lay three castle orchards, the hop-yard, and the cock-pit yard, and beyond them stretched the great Park, eight miles in circumference, with its magnificent timber, its herds of deer, and its game. A park by prescription, and not by grant from the crown, its turf had never been disturbed, and its soil, though in many places rocky, produced some of the

[1] In carrying out the works connected with the main drainage of Sheffield, it was found necessary to drive a drift right through the Castle Hill. The tunnel was at a considerable depth below the present level, being 18 ft. 6 in. below Waingate, and probably 40 ft. below Messrs. C. Chambers & Co.'s yard. It passed under the river Sheaf a little above the weir, at the back of the Alexandra Music Hall, and went obliquely across Castle hill to the end of Bridge street. Having tunnelled under the river, the workmen bored through a loose alluvial deposit, in which were found numbers of bones; the antlers of deer, and other remains. Arrived at the Castle Hill, they came upon the rock, a fine grained bluish stone, very hard to work, and in appearance resembling the Handsworth stone. Through this the sewer was made by blasting, and to carry on the works two shafts were sunk, one in Messrs. Chambers' yard and another near to Waingate. In the first shaft a discovery was made which vindicates the authority of tradition against the incredulity of modern learning. Mr. Hunter mentions, only to dismiss as a fable, the old story of a subterranean communication between the Castle and the Manor. The excavators, in sinking on Castle hill, cut across a subterranean passage excavated out of the solid rock, and running in the direction of the Market Hall, but whether it went to the Manor we cannot tell. It was partially obstructed with *debris*, but was still some four feet in height, and perfect as to its roof. It was never explored. The workmen and contractors had no time to be curious, and though an exploration was often talked of, it was never made; and when the shaft was finally filled up, a rubble wall was built across the passage to prevent the loose rock falling into it, and it was once more left to damp and darkness. In sinking the second shaft, at a depth of about 20 feet, a wall was encountered, and such portions of it as came in the line of operations were removed. An intelligent person, who watched the proceedings with much interest, says three walls were met with. The first was 12 feet in thickness, and may be assumed to have been an outer one. The next was 4½ feet, and the third 3 feet thick. Judging from the plinth stones, the original level of the ground appears to have been about 20 feet below the present surface, and sloped from the wall towards the river. My informant is of opinion that the Castle building was of large rubble with dressed quoins. The rubble, he thought, had come from the Soaphouse quarry. The dressed stone differs from that of any quarry now worked, but bears the nearest resemblance to the stone got out during the building of Mr. Reynolds' mortar mill, in Trippet lane.

largest trees in the kingdom. Many of them, says Harrison, rose sixty feet before they came to a knot or bough, and many were from twelve to fifteen feet in circumference. One large oak stood on the conduit plain and spread its arms on all sides to a distance of forty-five feet from the trunk, and was capable of giving shelter to above 200 horsemen. A magnificent avenue of walnut trees led from the park gate at "Shea bridge;" and long straight avenues of walnuts and oaks pointed from the different entrances towards the Lodge, near the centre of the Park.

John Evelyn, in his "Sylva, or discourse on Forest Trees," published in 1679, speaks with admiration of the timber at Sheffield. He says:—

"In the Hall Park, near unto Rivelin, stood an oak which had 18 yards without bough or knot, and carried a yard and six inches square at the said height, or length, and not much bigger near the root: sold 12 years ago for £11. Consider the distance of the place, and country, and what so prodigious a tree would have been worth near London.

"In Firth's farm, within Sheffield Lordship, about 20 years since, a tree, blown down by the wind, made, or would have made, two forge hammer beams, and in those and the other wood of that tree there was of worth, or made, £50; and Godfrey Frogat (who is now living) did oft say he lost £30 by the not buying of it. A hammer beam is not less than 7½ yards long, and 4 foot square at the barrel.

"In Sheffield Park, below the Manor, a tree was standing which was sold by one Giffard (servant to the then Countess of Kent), for £2. 10s., to one Nich. Hicks, which yielded of sawn wair 1400, and by estimation, 20 chords of wood.

"A wair is two yards long, and one foot broad, six score to the hundred; so that in the said tree was 10,080 foot of boards; which if any of the said boards were more than half-

inch thick, renders the thing yet more admirable. In the upper end of Rivelin stood a tree, called the Lord's Oak, of 12 yards about, and the top yielded 21 chord, cut down about thirteen years since. In Sheffield Park, *anno* 1646, stood above 100 trees, worth £1000, and there are yet two worth above £20. Still note the place and market.

"In the same Park, about eight years ago, Ralph Archdall cut a tree that was 13 foot diameter at the kerf or cutting place near the root.

"In the same Park, two years since, Mr. Sittwell, with Jo Magson, did chuse a tree, which after it was cut, and laid aside flat upon a level ground, Sam Staniforth, a keeper, and Ed Morphy, both on horseback, could not see over the tree one another's hat crowns. This tree was afterwards sold for £20.

"In the same Park, near the old ford, is an oak tree yet standing of 10 yards circumference. In the same Park, below the conduit plain, is an oak tree which bears a top whose boughs shoot from the bole some 15, and some 16 yards.

"Then admitting $15\frac{1}{2}$ yards for the common or mean extent of the boughs from the bole, which being doubled is 31 yards, and if it be imagined for a diameter, because the ratio of the diameter to the circumference is $\frac{1}{3}\frac{1}{5}\frac{3}{5}$, it follows 113. 355. :: 31. $97\frac{4}{11}\frac{4}{3}$ yards, which is the circumference belonging to this diameter.

"Then farther, it is demonstratable in geometery that half the diameter multiplied into half the circumference produces the area or quantity of the circle, and that will be found to be $754\frac{3}{4}\frac{4}{5}\frac{7}{2}$, which is 755 square yards feré.

"Then lastly, if a horse can be limited to three square yards of ground to stand on (which may seem a competent proportion of three yards long and one yard broad), then may 251 horse be well said to stand under the shade of this tree. But of the more northern cattle, certainly above twice that number."[1]

In the same chapter Evelyn says:—

"Being informed by a person of credit, that an oak in Sheffield Park, called the Ladies Oak, felled, contained 42 tun

[1] *Evelyn's Sylva*, cap. 30, sec. 15, pp. 168-169.

of timber, which had arms that held at least four foot square for 10 yards in length; the body six foot of clear timber. That in the same Park one might have chosen above 1000 trees worth above £6000; another 1000, worth £4000, and *sic de ceteris*. To this Mr. Halton replies that it might possibly be meant of the Lords Oak, already mentioned to have grown in Rivelin: for now Rivelin itself is totally destitute of that issue she once might have gloried in of oaks; there being only the Hall Park adjoining, which keeps up with its number of oaks. And as to the computation of 1000 trees formerly in Sheffield Park, worth £6000, it is believed there were a thousand much above that value; since in what is now inclosed, it is evident touching 100 worth a thousand pounds."[1]

Such were some of the sylvan glories of Sheffield Park, glories rivalling the famous oaks of Sherwood, and the well grown timber of the southern shires.

Besides the Castle, Lord Shrewsbury had, as we have already mentioned, a mansion in the Park, called Sheffield Lodge, or Sheffield Manor. This house was built by the fourth Earl of Shrewsbury, at the beginning of the 16th century. The records are not precise as to the date of the work, but Sir William Dugdale, in his notes on the armorial bearings seen by him in the great gallery,[2] has left us a tolerably clear indication of the period of its erection. Among other shields of no special significance were three well worthy of attention. One displayed the six great quarterings of Talbot impaling Hastings; another gave Talbot, as before, impaling Walden; and a third displayed France and England impaling Spain. The fourth Earl of Shrewsbury's first wife was Ann, daughter of William, Lord Hastings; and his second, Elizabeth, daughter of Sir Richard

[1] *Evelyn*, cap. 30, sec. 18. [2] Anno 1666.

Walden of Erith, in Kent. The gallery was built, therefore, after the second marriage, which took place about 1521 or 1522. The royal arms of England, impaling those of Spain, would not have been set up by a courtier after Henry VIII.'s conscience had become uneasy about his marriage with Catherine of Aragon, an event that was made public in the year 1527. Between 1522 and 1527, therefore, this gallery was built, and we cannot be far wrong in assigning to it the date of 1525.

The Manor House was a stone, timber, and brick erection, with "an inward court and an outward court, two gardens and three yards." The chief entrance was on the west side, between two lofty octagonal towers of stone and brick, from which a flight of steps led to the great hall, and thence northwards to the long gallery, which occupied the whole west front northward of the entrance gates, and terminated at the north-west angle of the building in a "goodlie" tower chamber, probably the best lodging in the house. On the south front were the chief rooms of the mansion, the apartments being numerous but small; and from the east end of this front the buildings returned for a short distance towards the north. In the enclosure between the tower chamber on the north, the long gallery on the west, and the range of buildings on the south, lay the garden, the original wall of which, forming its eastern boundary, is still standing. Away to the east lay the stable yard, access to which was obtained by a gateway, which may still be seen nearly opposite the main entrance; and among the buildings still stand-

ing are interesting remains of a strongly timbered barn. Outside the south front lay a terrace garden, and betwen the main entrance and the present Manor Farm stretched a pleasant level lawn. Of the internal arrangement of the Lodge we have little information. Probably an inventory of the furniture there and at the Castle, made in 1582, and preserved among the Talbot papers at the College of Arms, gives the most complete account that has come down to us, both of the apartments and their contents, and that is all too scanty to satisfy the curious enquirer after the relics of Sheffield's feudal age.[1] From this we learn that there was the great gallery on the west, in which the fallen Wolsey paced with his kindly host; the tower chamber, containing two fair corded bedsteads of inlaid work, in which my Lord Cardinal slept; the great chamber, with its cistern of alabaster; the queen's gallery, with its ashen table; the queen's chamber and her "utter" chamber; the nursery containing "a fair square chest inlaid with white bone made by my Lord Francis, with the Talbot and F. S.," almost spoiled through evil using; the porter's lodge, the chamber over the stable; the kitchens and larders; a wash-house, and a low wash-house, a pantry, brewhouse, and bakehouse, besides the workmen's chamber, the saddler's chamber, and several others. The walls were hung with tapestry representing the story of Hercules, the story of the Pas-

[1] Talbot papers, College of Arms, v. G, f. 150, *et seq*. The inventory was published, along with a paper by Stephen I. Tucker, Esq., Rouge Croix, on "The Descent of the Manor of Sheffield," in the Archæological Society's Journal for 1874, vol. 30, pp. 237—277. The inventory is headed thus:—"A brief inventory [of my] Lord's household stuff [at Sheffield] Castle, and Sheffield Lodge, within the charge of John Deckinson and Wm. Kettericke, the wardroppe men and others, seen and viewed the 18th day of June, 1582."

sion, and other religious and classical histories; there were Turkey carpets, embroidered bed hangings, crimson and velvet cushions, and chairs covered with purple velvet and embroidered with cloth of gold, with crimson silk and silver, and some with cloth of tissue, besides other evidences to show the comfort and even luxury of Lord Shrewsbury's mansion.

Standing apart from the main building of the Manor is a small Lodge of three stories, to the upper one of which local tradition has constantly attached the name of Queen Mary's room, and writers have told how her ghost has been seen there.[1] It was occupied for many years as a farm-house, and out-buildings were added for the convenience of the tenant. Mr. Hunter, in his "History of Hallamshire," spoke of this edifice as a porter's lodge, erected by Earl Gilbert (1590-1616), but on this point it is clear the learned and careful topographer has fallen into a mistake. In 1871, the Rev. J. Stacye, Chaplain of the Shrewsbury Hospital, at Sheffield, directed attention to the remarkable characteristics of the building. He showed that the rooms were ornamented as no mere porter's lodge would have been, and the best room was at the top of the house. The only access to the chambers was by a narrow turret staircase, which also communicated with the leaden roof; and his suggestion was, that in this case, tradition might after all be right, and that we had here a detached building erected by the Earl of Shrewsbury expressly for the custody of the Queen of Scots. Subsequent inves-

[1] *Holland's* "Sheffield Park," pp. 13 and 14, Edition 1859.

tigation has further strengthened this idea. The attention of the Duke of Norfolk, the successor of the Earls of Shrewsbury in the Hallamshire estates, was directed to the decaying state of the building, and to the memories that lingered about it, and in 1872, he caused it to be thoroughly and carefully restored, under the supervision of Messrs. Hadfield and Son, architects. On the 18th January, 1875, Mr. Charles Hadfield read a paper before the Royal Institute of British Architects, describing the work that had been done. He says:—

"It was evident, on the removal of the farm buildings erected about a century ago, and abutting on the north and south fronts, that it had been originally a detached building, excepting alone traces in the centre of each front, from the plinth to the level of the 1st floor string, of what was probably a boundary wall, and a chamfered doorway jamb still remains engaged to the plinth course on the south front. The general character of the details of the design is about forty years later in date than the work at the Manor, and it is therefore probable, that the structure was erected early in Elizabeth's reign. The Manor itself was inhabitable, and occasionally inhabited, from 1616 to 1706, and from that date to the present time has been steadily crumbling away. A colliery shaft was, about thirty-five years ago, sunk hard by the 'fayre tower chamber where my Lorde was lodged.' Squalid and ricketty cottages, like parasites, have fastened themselves about the tottering walls; indeed anything more dangerous than these dwellings, or better calculated to rouse the ire of our sanitary reformers, cannot well be conceived; and it is satisfactory to learn they are only on sufferance, until arrangements for their removal can be effected, and the ruins enclosed and protected, as far as practicable, from further destruction."

Further on Mr. Hadfield says:—

"The Lodge consisted of a ground, chamber, and upper floor, with a circular stone staircase surmounted by a brick

turret, by which staircase alone access was obtained to the various parts of the interior, and the lead flat, or terrace. The ground floor had originally, and as now restored, two rooms separated by a braced oak partition or studding, plastered, on which the main floor girders rested. The floors above, owing to the decay of the timber ends, and the weakening of the lower part of the partition by the opening of a modern doorway and the originally defective construction, had sunk, and it therefore became necessary on the ground floor to replace the studding by a brick wall, which now takes the whole weight of the upper floors and roof. The inner room once had a separate external entrance, traces of which were found when removing one of the modern window frames, and it was considered advisable, in the absence of evidence as to the design of this doorway, to wall up the opening, leaving the fragments of the jamb stones *in situ*, a lintel being put across to carry the walling. In each room is a capacious stone fire place, and two windows with stone mullions and transomes. The internal doors are of oak, hung to chamfered oak posts; those which give access from the staircase to the various chambers being specially strong, as the original iron crooks which remain in the jambs bear testimony. The ground and first floor apartments are now used as a dwelling for the caretaker, the upper floor remaining unoccupied, as it has been for many years past.

"The first or chamber floor, consisting of inner and outer chambers, is divided as below, the floor being of gypsum or plaster, and the inner room having a ribbed plaster ceiling of simple but effective geometric pattern; the fire places are of stone as below, with herring-bone brick backs, and stone fender hearths, and they were found unaltered on the removal of the modern grates and chimney pieces, which had, luckily, only masked them. Still ascending the stair, we come to what was undoubtedly the principal apartment in the lodge. This room, with its heraldic mantel piece, its admirably designed ceiling, and general *ensemble*, has always been popularly known as 'Queen Mary's room.' There is an ante-chamber attached, and the floors are also of plaster,

as is the case at Haddon Hall and other local mansions of the period. It may, in passing, be well to note here, that in both these upper rooms hooks are remaining close under the plaster cornice mold, from which, doubtless, the tapestry was suspended. Evident care had been taken with the design and execution of this beautiful ceiling, for such it undoubtedly is. The rib moldings are well designed, sharp and delicate as becomes the material, plaster, in which the work is executed; the panels contain delicately modelled enrichment of early Elizabethan character, and the Talbot badge encircled by the garter, surmounted with the coronet, is prominently displayed in the leading panels.

"The repairing of this work was an operation of some difficulty, for it was found on examination that the ends of many of the ceiling joists, as indeed was the case with the bearing timbers throughout the building, had become decayed; and further, that the oak plastering laths were much decayed above; portions of the ceiling itself had also been damaged by the leakage from the roof, and the delicate ornament was nearly obliterated by repeated coatings of limewhite. It was necessary, in the first place, to splice the ends of the joists, and thus give them a good bearing on the walls; but before attempting to do this, the whole ceiling was carefully propped from the underside. The work of splicing was then carried out in safety, the decayed laths removed and replaced, by blue slate secured to the oak ceiling joists, and run solid with plaster, and the lead flat relaid. The whitewash was removed by repeated softenings with warm water and the application of a hair brush, the enriched panels, some of which had become loosened, were securely fastened, and the whole then carefully flatted in oil colour to prevent future damage. Immediately below the cornice molding is a frieze composed of conventional ornament of exceedingly graceful character, eight inches deep, with a neck molding at the foot, which, no doubt, formed a border to the tapestried hangings of the room. So far as could be ascertained from a careful inspection, there were no traces of colour or gilding, which, as is well known, was freely used on such ceilings at that period."

The upper room, in addition to its rich ceiling, and its hooks for tapestry, had also over the fireplace an elaborate heraldic achievement in plaster, representing the arms of George, the sixth Earl of Shrewsbury, as blazoned on his Garter plate, a circumstance that makes it all but certain that it was the keeper of the Queen of Scots who erected this building. That he did build a lodge of some kind, and thought it of sufficient importance to send a plan to Lord Burghley,[1] we know from a letter dated the 4th August, 1577; that it was this identical lodge we can only infer.

A flat lead roof, enclosed by a stone parapet, surmounts the edifice we have been describing. Mr. Hadfield says of it:—

"The lead forming this flat is the original covering, and in order to preserve it as far as possible intact, it has been taken up and relaid, sheet by sheet, upon new lead, after the repairs to the roofing timbers. The winding stair is enclosed by a circular turret, built with thin red bricks, and surmounted by a lead covered dome. On the removal of the rough casting which covered the exterior, a small window or loop hole, which commanded the road from the Manor to the town, was brought to view."

On this elevation it is probable the Queen of Scots took the air, and enjoyed the prospect, over the vales of Don, Sheaf, and Porter. The view on a clear day is most extensive. Even the dirt of a manufacturing town fails wholly to destroy the charm of the landscape. The hills are the old

[1] Shrewsbury to Burghley.—*Talbot Papers*, P. f. 837. In the postscript Shrewsbury says: "I have sent Greves a plat of a front of a lodge that I am now in building, which, if it were not for troubling your Lordship, I would wish your advice thereon." The letter is endorsed "4 August, 1577. The Earl of Shrewsbury to my L. a platte of a Lodge."

hills of Hallamshire, as they rise above the valleys, where flow her five streams. In their former wildness they were grand; but even now, cultivated, fenced off, built upon, gashed by quarries, marred by mine heaps, blackened by chimneys, they retain much of their old charm, and tempt the men of Sheffield to emerge from their crowded town and breathe God's air.

Mr. Hunter says:—"The fir-crowned heights of Norton, the sweet vale of Beauchief, the purple moor of Totley, and the barren hills of the Peak, the thick woods of Wharncliffe and Wentworth, the widening vale of the Don, and the hills of Laughton and Handsworth, each distinguishable by its spire, are all comprehended within the view from this elevation. The Manor itself, its towers and battlements, appearing above the thick woods in which it was embosomed, must have once formed a prominent and striking object in the scenery from many points of the surrounding country." [1]

Sheffield Lodge, and the Castle in the valley, now so uninviting, then so beautiful and so strong, were to be the prisons of Mary of Scotland for nearly fourteen years. She entered them with broken health and disappointed hopes; but hope was not dead, and she still looked forward to her ultimate restoration.

It is not a little singular that among Mary's English residences, Sheffield, which really occupied the most important, has sunk into the most insignificant place. It is scarcely ever spoken of in connection

[1] *Hunter's* "Hallamshire," p. 335. Gatty's edition.

with her name, while houses where she never was, such as Hardwick, are rich in the traditions that hang about her memory. Popular ideas connect her with Bolton, Tutbury and Fotheringhay, and yet her sojourns in those places were mere passing visits compared with the years she spent at Sheffield. Perhaps the reason is to be found in the circumstances of the town. The inexorable demands of modern activity pushed aside the relics of the past. The Castle disappeared, and the Manor became an unpicturesque ruin. There was no shrine to invite pilgrimage, or give visible aid to faith. Sheffield and Mary became dissociated, and the town of knives yielded its pre-eminence to localities with less claim to consideration.

In the early days of her residence in Sheffield Castle, Mary found the worst fears about her sickness realized. It was "No thing slacket," but waxed "rather to the worse nor the better:" so she fulfilled her promise to the Bishop of Ross, and advertised him thereof with diligence. The news reached London on Sunday, the 3rd December, when Sir F. Walsingham noted in his diary, "That the Queen of Scotes shoulde be verie sycke."[1] The following day the Bishop of Ross, taking with him two physicians, Doctors Astloe and Good, set out to join his mistress, not at Tutbury, as Walsingham has it, but at Sheffield. Travelling with all speed, they reached their destination on Friday, the 8th. What they there found may be best read in the

[1] Mary to the Bishop of Ross. Chatsworth, Nov. 27.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots.*, v. v., No. 91. *Walsingham's Diary.*—Camden Society, p. 1.

words of the Bishop of Ross, who, on the 11th December, wrote to Cecil as follows:—

"We found the Queen's Majesty, my mistress, much molested with a continual distillation from her head into her stomach, whereof hath grown such debility and weakness in that part, that she neither hath desire to any meat, neither faculty to retain that long when she doth eat it. She is troubled also with an incessant provocation to vomit, by the which she hath and doth avoid a very great quantity of raw, tough and slimy fleome, without any great or manifest relief or release of her pains, likewise she is molested with a great inflammation and tension in her left side, under her short ribs, which reacheth so far every way that they yet doubt whether it be the inflammation of the stomach, the spleen, the womb, or of all those three parts together, as rather by the accidents which do follow her Grace, they do gather. Her Grace is likewise troubled with continual lack of sleep, which hath continued for ten or twelve days past, all which time she hath kept her bed, and still remaineth in the same estate, continually afflicted with sighs and pensiveness. Before the coming of the physicians, her Majesty was much molested with vehement fits of the mother, with the which also she hath been marvellously afflicted this xth of December, in the morning. The ixth of December, they gave her Highness a gentle potion to cleanse her stomach and first viens, which, through the great weakness of those parts, she vomited again. The xth they proved a fresh, but her Highness could not brook it in any form, neither yet anything that she received the same morning. Besides the judgment of the physicians, I do perfectly understand that her diseases proceedeth of extreme thought and care, and of want of wonted exercises, and are daily increased by the same, and now grow so grievous and intolerable, that unless the occasions thereof may be speedily taken away, her Highness is like to fall into some farther and greater inconvenients than yet are perceived, which albeit they do not procure present death, whereof, thanks be unto Almighty God, by the judgment of the physicians there is no cause of suspicion at this present, are too

likely to make her life more loathsome and wearisome unto her Highness than death itself would be. Was told by Q. Elizabeth to write an account of her health. Encloses a letter for her. No one can cure this malady as well as the Queen, and that without offence to her conscience or honour, or prejudice to her estate or her country. Asks Cecil to help that some resolution may be procured in her affairs. There is no news of our Commissioners from Scotland. Asks Cecil to write to Shrewsbury to grant a passport for a servant of Q. Mary's to go to Scotland for news of their diet. He will not do so without special command. Believes 'there is some other to come nor was first nominate, in respect of their long tarry.' Hopes Dumferling is despatched into Scotland according to the Queen's determination, for his stay hinders the treaty. Sheffield. 11 Dec. 1570."[1]

Making some allowance for the Bishop's desire to produce an effect, we shall not be uncharitable in concluding that this sickness was not altogether alarming. Death was not anticipated, but great inconvenience, and then came the usual intimation, "No one can cure this malady as well as the Queen." That was the key-note. The meaning of all Mary's actions, and all the Bishop's words, was, "proceed with the treaty." Elizabeth's coldness alarmed them, and they resolved to leave no opportunity unimproved to bring her back to the mood in which she was when Cecil and Mildmay were sent to Chatsworth.

To this end the treaty, with its securities, was carefully revised, and on every article Mary gave specific instructions to the Bishops of Ross and Galloway, and Lord Livingstone.[2]

[1] *Signed. Addressed. Endorsed.—MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. v., No. 93.

[2] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. v., No. 96. Miss Strickland prints these instructions, v. 2, p. 23, but misdates them 1580, instead of 1570.

To Elizabeth the Queen of Scots wrote on the 29th December, saying that she was "partly convalescit," and praying earnestly for the conclusion of the treaty, since her nobility had consented to the arrangement, and left it to her discretion to agree to anything that might be proposed for her liberty and restitution, even if the terms went the length of giving hostages and pledges, and included the yielding of her son as a hostage. In special letters, expressed in cordial terms, Mary also wrote to Leicester and to Cecil, entreating their assistance in forwarding the treaty, and pledging herself in most ample phrases to act truly and honourably towards the Queen of England.[1]

Thus the year came to a close, a year that had been fraught with many experiences for the Queen of Scots, but one scarcely comparing in importance with that about to open upon her.[2]

[1] *Labanoff*, v. 3, pp. 146, 148, 150, 152, 154.

[2] As a fitting subject for meditation, especially as Mary was so vehement and so plausible, Cecil refreshed her memory by procuring a note of the former treaties that had been begun and abandoned since 1568. The Memorandum is as follows—

"A brief note of all the treaties that have passed for the Scottish Queen's enlargement, and the several causes why they took not effect, since her repair into this realm, which was in A°. 1568." *The First Treaty*, 1568, begun at York, 30 Sept. 1568, and prorogued to London.

The Commissioners were—*For the Scotch Queen*—Lords Boyde and Harris, Bp. of Ross, L. (lairds) of Lochinvar and Skirling, the Abbot of Kildwing.

For the Scotch Nobility—Earls of Murray and Mourton, Lord Lyndsaye, Bp. of Orsmay, Abbot of Dunfermeling.

For the Q. of England—Duke of Norfolk, Earl of Sussex, Sir Rafe Sadler, to whom were joined afterwards, the earls of Arrundell and Leycester, Sir Nicolas Bacon, lord keeper; Lord Clinton, lord admiral; Sir W. Cycill, now lord treasurer.

This treaty took no effect, partly because her Majesty was secretly informed that Lord Boyd, and the Bp. of Ross, practised to steal away the Scotch Queen, but principally because Q. Mary's commissioners were inhibited to enter into the examination of Darnley's murder, and were, by a special commission from her, commanded to dissolve the treaty. 15 Dec. 1568.

The second treaty began 24 April, 1569, the Bp. of Ross alone being sent to deal with the Q. of England, and the lords of her council.

During this treaty, which was entertained by her Majesty with all kindness,

a marriage was practised underhand without her privity, between Norfolk and the Scotch Queen, which was communicated to the Spanish and French Ambassadors, and to certain of the nobility of the north of England, before she was acquainted with it. Candishe [Cavendish] was sent secretly by the duke to the Scotch Queen with letters and tokens to further the match. The Earl of Northumberland sent Leonard Dacres to propound to the Scotch Queen a means of escape, which not succeeding, he brake into an open rebellion. The Earl of Westmoreland did the same, and by help of Scotland invaded England. These things, discovered by her Majesty, were impediments to the second treaty.

20 May, 1570. A third treaty began 'for' the French Ambassador and the Bp. of Ross, who offered to the lords of her majesty's council certain articles, among others, that all English fugitives in Scotland should be delivered or kept there to be forthcoming at the end of the treaty.

[This last paragraph is struck out.]

—Pp. 3. *Endorsed—MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. v., No. 97.

CHAPTER VII.

THE year 1571 opened with what we conventionally call an old fashioned winter. At Christmas the frost set in. On the 6th January, the cold was such that no one could go out of doors, nor one friend go to another.[1] The Captive in Sheffield Castle felt its biting power adding not a little to the discomforts of her situation. On the 8th, writing by the hand of her secretary to the Bishop of Ross, Mary tells him she would have written herself, "but the weakness which yet remains in our person, and the rheum wherewith we are newly tormented through the continuing of this storm, would not permit us."[2]

The two physicians, who came in December, were at this time returning to London, and Mary, while thanking Elizabeth for sending them, acknowledged that they had "tane grit panys" for the recovery of her health. On the 13th January they were gone, and she reminded the Bishop that they might communicate to the Queen her state of health, if she was pleased to hear it, adding, "we are in the same state they left us in, and does what we can to obtain quietness."[3]

[1] Cave to Huntingdon.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VI., No. 1.

[2] *Labanoff*, v. 3, p. 162.

[3] Mary to Ross, Jan. 8th and 13th, 1570-1.—*Labanoff*, v, 3, pp. 161-169.

The burden of Mary's letters was the treaty. The treaty would relieve her of "unquietness of mind," and be better than any physician. "We know no other remedy but the treaty, which lies in the Queen our good sister's hands, to put an end thereby to such miseries." Again writing to the Bishop of Ross on the 18th January, and speaking of her health, she says,

"Of our health he will show you, which is not yet reduced to a sure perfection, but ever ready either to the worse or the better of a sudden, as occasion moveth. Wherefore we look to hear of some comfortable proceeding and resolution in our affairs thereabove, by the good and favourable aid of the Queen our good sister, which will serve more to our convalescence and entire health than all other physic in the world. And by the contrary, if otherwise it should happen to our causes, far from our expectation, we shall be tent to begin again with new dolour and sickness." [1]

"Comfortable proceeding and resolution," however, Mary could not obtain, for matters were coming to light which fully convinced Elizabeth that her safety, and the welfare of her kingdom, depended on the safe keeping of the Queen of Scots. When the treaty was begun in the autumn, the Norfolk marriage was supposed to be abandoned, and hostile negotiations with France and Spain at an end. Pledges the most ample were given by the Queen of Scots, that she would never trouble the peace of the realm, that her only desire was to end her days in quiet and in freedom. The progress of time cast some doubt on the perfect sincerity of these professions, and with the new year it became clear not only that the marriage with Norfolk was still

[1] *Labanoff*, v. 3, pp. 171-2.

contemplated, but that Mary and her partizans were intriguing with the enemies of England.

In the middle of January, Shrewsbury reduced the number of the Queen of Scots' servants, and sent away those above the prescribed number of thirty. On the 19th, Queen Elizabeth warned the Earl of a secret preparation of horsemen in Scotland, near the Border, part of whom were "to be well breathed for a long journey." The Queen "not knowing as yet the intent thereof," thought it "not amiss" to warn him "to look more narrowly to his charge, lest some adventure might be made" as far as his house. She did not wish him to indicate any doubt, but only to be more careful.[1] So far, however, the Court was acting on somewhat vague information. Enough was known to excite suspicion and uneasiness, but definite facts were wanting, and while they were being looked for, it was the policy of Elizabeth to keep from her captive all knowledge that anything was suspected. Shrewsbury was to be vigilant, but to indicate no doubt. Meanwhile Cecil and the Council were carefully probing every avenue for information.

The Queen of Scots, still hoping that her plans were developing satisfactorily, though not without suspicions because of the delay of the treaty, continued to pour out her complaints and entreaties. All through January and February, her letters to the Bishop of Ross were frequent. On the 24th January, she requested him to haste to her the wine which the perfumer left with him, as it might do

[1] *A Draft in Cecil's hand.—MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. vi,, No. 6.

her great pleasure in her then state; together with any other drugs he liked to send, with more cinnamon water, and the virginals.[1] Such requests were but the bye-play. The serious business of life was the treaty, and to the forwarding of the treaty all her energies were directed. When the perfumer brought the wine, he also brought letters, but the Queen was still weak. Her "convalescence forth of this sickness" was slow, but the progress of the treaty was slower. She told the Bishop to "pray most effectuously the Queen . . . in all possible diligence to proceed and conclude" the negotiations.[2] Two days afterwards, Mary instructed Ross to apply for a passport for the Archbishop of Glasgow to visit her, adding an autograph postscript to the letter, "fail not to seek to obtain this by all means, as you will answer to me."[3]

On the 18th February, in a letter to the Bishop, Mary again pressed in the strongest language for the furtherance of the treaty, adding as to the state of her health :—

"We have been so vexed with a continual distillation of the rheum since Cuthbert's here arriving (of whom we received of your letters), which moved us to be so evil at ease that we might not abide the hearing of any affairs, and especially of your accounts. And albeit these two days past we have been some part more at quiet, yet we might scantly spare one hour of every day to the audience of the same, but has always heard the summary thereof, and considered the principal of the particulars, as he will show you at length."[4]

Along with this letter, Mary sent others, to the Earls of Sussex, and Leicester, and Sir William

[1] *Labanoff*, v. 3, p. 173. [2] *Labanoff*, v. 3, p. 175. [3] *Labanoff*, v. 3, p. 179. [4] *Labanoff*, v. 3, p. 193.

Cecil, praying their assistance, and picturing her miserable state. Still no response from Elizabeth. The passport for the Archbishop of Glasgow was refused, on the ground that he, with the Papal Nuncio, and the Cardinal of Lorraine, had been planning an invasion of Ireland, an accusation which Mary denounced as unjust. But it was not possible to deny that Lord Seaton had gone into Flanders early in January, to solicit aid for his mistress from the Duke of Alva, and that Mary was in personal correspondence with this odious Spaniard, with the design of effecting a Spanish invasion. Equally impossible was it to deny that France, as well as Spain, was being played upon, for Mary was urging, through her Ambassador in Paris, an invasion, or at least "some preparations for sending into Scotland:" "For so long as she [Elizabeth] sees that the King tarries upon that, she will spin matters out, and make use of the time, as she has been accustomed to do." [1]

Matters of this kind were not intended to reach the ears of Elizabeth and her Ministers. With them Mary tried, first entreaty, then darkly veiled hints at foreign aid. Now she would try flattery, and see if

[1] *Teulet*, v. 5, p, 66. *Turnbull*, pp, 179 and 181.—A personal touch or two from the letter of January 7th may be here introduced. Mary says:—"I have been much relieved by the presents which Raulet has brought to me, which have come very seasonably, for in place of them I must have given money, and the cost would have been double at the least. I wish that twice the amount might be sent again to me, for it is of great use to me. I pray you to see that a supply of money is obtained for me—as much as possible. The stay which the physicians have made here—now a month past—and the defraying of the Commissioners, who are at my expense, will run off with a great deal, and in whatever direction matters turn, I shall have enough to do with it, whether the arrangement is made or not. If Lord Seton is still in Flanders, write to him promptly that I beg him to hasten the transmission of the money to Scotland, for the Castle [Edinburgh] has need of it."—Mary to the Archbishop of Glasgow.—*Turnbull*, p. 180.

by that means the treaty could be settled before the meeting of the English Parliament, which stood prorogued to the 2nd of April, when, it was certain, attempts would be renewed to arrange the succession to the exclusion of the Scottish Queen. No sooner did Mary hear of the refusal of the passport for the Archbishop of Glasgow, than she wrote to the Bishop of Ross, on the 4th March, desiring him to render "conding thankis" to the Queen for her "honest demonstration" on receiving Mary's former letter. He was to assure Elizabeth

"Not only of a reciprocal good will, but of a love and reverence such as we would bear to our mother or eldest sister, having no parent in this world nearer, nor yet of whom we hope to obtain more favour and amity, which augments in us from day to day the desire we have to be so happy as to come to her presence, and see with our own eyes that which we could not comprehend but by the sight of others, of her perfections."

The Parliament, continued Mary, was going to meet on the 2nd of April, and considering the acts of the last Parliament, she thought it not unlikely that her good sister might be pressed to settle the succession. If that were so, she begged nothing might be done to her own prejudice. Might she not come to be near the Queen, 'at the least secretly, under protestation that she shall not be importuned nor pressed by us in anything.' Lest Elizabeth should doubt her 'sincerity and innocency touching the byepast troubles,' the Bishop was instructed to say this in Mary's name. 'Among the most ardent wishes that we can make, is that would God she might read it within the heart, which is the same that we had at that time, and is not changed in any sort, which would be an inexpugnable defence against all those who would persuade her sinisterly of our intention.' Elizabeth was to be satisfied also that there was no truth in the reported enterprise of the Cardinal of Lorraine and others; for the Bishop's letter of the 29th February was the first word she had heard of the scheme, and

she was sure her uncle and the Nuncio would never have made such a proposal without acquainting her with the same; and as to her ambassador, the Archbishop of Glasgow, 'he is over circumspect to proceed so far without our knowledge or commission.'[1]

Would to God, prayed Mary, Elizabeth might read her heart. The impious prayer was needless. Elizabeth had but to read her letters to perceive with whom she was dealing. Even while at Chatsworth, Mary had been in communication with the Pope, the Duke of Alva, and the King of France, but now she had resolved finally to throw herself into the arms of Philip; for Elizabeth had at this time on hand one of her ridiculous matrimonial negotiations, and Mary perceived that if a marriage took place between the Queen of England and the youthful Duke of Anjou, her hopes from France were at an end. Spain in that case was her best chance, and to Spain she therefore addressed herself.

There was living in London, at this time, an Italian banker or merchant, named Robert Ridolfi, a man of great ability and address, whose religious convictions naturally led him to favour the cause of Catholic revival. He had been somewhat compromised by his dealings with the rebel Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, but had cleared himself to the satisfaction of the English Council, and had since been consulted by Cecil about the misunderstandings with Spain. Of this man, the Queen of Scots and the Duke of Norfolk made choice as their agent, in negotiating with the

[1] Mary to Ross, 4th March, 1570-71, condensed.—*Labanoff*, v. 3, p. 195.

Pope, with the Duke of Alva, and with the King of Spain.

Early in February, when Mary was most earnestly soliciting the prosecution of her treaty with Elizabeth, she prepared a statement of her plans and hopes for the information of the Bishop of Ross and the Duke of Norfolk. The Duke of Alva had informed her that if the then projected marriage between the Queen of England and the Duke of Anjou were carried into effect, it would be her "destruction and ruin." The advice of her friends in England was to escape, and there were plans innumerable devised for this purpose; but one great difficulty was, where to escape to. She could not go into Scotland without an army to sustain her, and it would not be safe to go into France with the Anjou marriage in prospect. After weighing all the points, she concluded that her best hopes centred in Spain, and proposed, if liberty could be obtained, to go there, and treat with Philip in person. But before this could be done, the way must be made plain. Mary was not yet out of prison, and was not quite sure that Philip would take up her cause, or even that he might not treat her, if she got into his hands, in ways worse than Elizabeth had done. When the latter doubt crossed her mind, she dismissed it, alleging Philip's "goodness, conscience, and uprightness" as pledges for the surety of her person. Still, it was needful as a first step, "to send some faithful man towards the King of Spain," to explain to him the position of affairs, and see if he would "sustain and embrace"

her cause. Her son she was ready to place in Philip's hands. As to her own marriage with Don John, she "will hear nothing thereof," but trusted that circumstance would not prevent Philip aiding her. As to an agent to employ in this transaction, Mary could think of no one so likely as Ridolfi. "The negotiation must be holden very secret." France must know nothing of it; and certainly not the Queen of England; but the Duke of Norfolk was to be consulted, and if he approved, the thing might be attempted at once. These instructions were dated the 8th February, and were afterwards found among the Duke of Norfolk's papers. [1]

As Mary very reasonably urged, the occasion required "diligence and ability." The timid but ambitious Norfolk realised this fact, overcame his scruples, and risked his neck. He approved the choice of Ridolfi, and both he and Mary Stuart gave to this agent full instructions to lay before the Pope and the King of Spain. The Duke said he and his friends were prepared to adventure their lives, and could raise 20,000 foot, and 3000 horse. "Yet being imperfectly provided, we cannot do all of ourselves. We ask his Majesty for money, arms, ammunition, troops, and especially for some experienced soldier to lead us." [2]

On the 18th February, Mary Stuart wrote a letter to the Duke of Alva accrediting Ridolfi; and about the same time the Duke of Norfolk wrote to Philip,

[1] Memoire addressed by Mary Stuart to the Bishop of Ross, 8th February, 1570-71.—*Labanoff*, v. 3, p. 180.

[2] *Turnbull*, 198, et seq.

informing him that he had decided to place himself at the head of the English and Scotch nobility for the purpose of re-establishing the Catholic religion in the two kingdoms. Before the departure of Ridolfi for Brussels, on the 24th March, he had a secret interview with the Duke of Norfolk, into whose presence he was conveyed by Barker, the Duke's secretary, and there by word of mouth the final touches were given to the scheme.[1]

The plans were thus completed, and Mary and her confederates could only wait in seeming innocence the development of the plot. The part of the Queen of Scots was to play the humble suppliant to Elizabeth. The Duke of Norfolk, under surveillance in his own house, was condemned to trying inactivity. The Bishop of Ross, and the friends of Mary, were busy planning her escape, and weaving the threads of the great Catholic conspiracy. Elizabeth and her ministers, suspicious and uneasy, but not fully informed, were anxiously seeking for light and guidance. So far were they from guessing the truth, that Cecil, created Baron Burghley on the 25th February, was actually employing Ridolfi, on an informal mission to the Duke of Alva, about trade with the Low Countries. Prospects on the whole were favourable to the Catholic cause, and with adroit management, and the favour of fortune, all might turn out well. Mary played her part with her accustomed skill. On the 10th March, she wrote to Lord Burghley, entreating him to further the "godlie work" of the treaty.[2] On the 19th she

[1] *Labanoff*, v. 3, p. 254. [2] *Labanoff*, v. 3, p. 209.

wrote to the Bishops of Ross and Galloway, and Lord Livingstone, her commissioners, complaining of delay, and protesting her honest intentions. "Yet we will not despair," she says, "but hope that our said good sister will more pitifully look upon our most just and reasonable suits, and take a good and hasty resolution therein for the weal of us both, and the common quietness of this isle." If the Queen would not restore her to her realm, perhaps she would restore her authority in Scotland, Mary remaining in England and being well entertained. But if she would not do even this, the Commissioners were to demand the restoration of the articles made at Chatsworth, that Mary might not be prejudiced thereby, and they were then to apply to the ambassadors of the Kings, her good brethren, to solicit "honest treatment." Another ground of complaint she had, and that a more personal one.

"My Lord of Shrewsbury has meanit to us that he will not permit any man that is forth of the appointed number of our servants here, that shall come toward us either from one part or another, to remain longer than five days, because (says he), Thomas Car, who departed herefrom the 15th day of this instant, toward Scotland, remained a whole fortnight. Indeed he could not be sooner despatched by reason we wrote generally to all our good subjects of the good appearance you did advertise us there was of the good and hasty expedition of the issue of this treaty." Wherefore, continues Mary, when they obtained passports in the future for messengers, the number of days they might remain was to be specified.[1]

On the 27th March, Mary dated a letter from Sheffield to Queen Elizabeth, declaring that she

[1] Mary to the Bishops of Ross and Galloway, and Lord Livingstone, dated Sheffield, 19th March 1570-1.—*Labanoff*, v. 3, p. 211 et seq.

had placed her cause in her hands, without seeking the favour of any other, and taking an oath that she desired to do nothing to displease her.[1] This was three days after the sailing of Ridolfi, and seven days after Mary had sent her thanks and prayers to the Duke of Alva, whom she was anxious to persuade into an invasion of England on her behalf.[2]

Fortunately for Elizabeth, and for the Protestant cause, light was about to be thrown on this dark intrigue. Pending the negotiation of the treaty with the Queen of Scots, there had been a suspension of arms in Scotland, which was to terminate on the 1st April, and it was resolved, on the part of the Regent, to signalize the resumption of hostilities by a notable success. Crawford of Jordanhill, a friend of Darnley's, agreed to lead a surprise against the almost impregnable Castle of Dumbarton, on the Clyde, which was held by Lord Fleming for Queen Mary. Towards midnight on the 31st March, he and his men set out, and just before dawn on the following morning, they succeeded by skill and daring in scaling the rock, surmounting the battlements, and surprising the garrison. Among other valuable captures in the place, were a number of documents which were sent to London, including a memoir, by Claude Hamilton, on the negotiations with the Duke of Alva. This at once showed the government of Elizabeth what it had to fear, and

[1] Mary to Elizabeth, 27th March.—*Labanoff*, v. 3, p. 254.

[2] In a Memorandum given by the Queen of Scots to John Hamilton for the Duke of Alva, dated from Sheffield the 20th March 1571, Mary sets forth her views. A contemporary copy is preserved at Brussels, and the document is printed in French by Prince Labanoff, v. 3, p. 216 et seq., and by Turnbull, in an English translation, p. 186, et seq.

where to look for the danger. Lord Burghley took instant action. He was too late to stop Ridolfi, but soon came upon others of the conspirators, and little by little the whole plot was unravelled before him.

At Dover, Charles Bailly, one of the secretaries of the Bishop of Ross, was arrested on his return from Flanders, where he had been engaged in passing through the press a work by the Bishop, entitled, "A treatise concerning the defence of the honour of Mary, Queen of Scotland." Meeting with Ridolfi at Brussels, and both being engaged in the same enterprise, Bailly assisted in ciphering some despatches, which he undertook to convey to London. These papers were in his possession when seized at Dover, and were placed in the custody of Lord Cobham, warden of the Cinque ports. The capture was not at first believed to be of the importance it afterwards proved, and Lord Cobham, through the treacherous suggestions of his brother, was induced to give the Bishop of Ross an opportunity of tampering with the packet. Two letters addressed, "30" and "40," intended for the Duke of Norfolk and Lord Lumley, were, by the Bishop's means, forwarded to their destination. The others were retained by the Bishop of Ross, and in their place a packet was made up of carefully concocted letters, just treasonable enough to satisfy Burghley, but compromising none of the English nobility. This was left in Lord Cobham's hands. Having thus accomplished what he supposed to be a clever stroke, the Bishop, with the smooth face of in-

jured innocence, wrote to Lord Burghley requesting the delivery of the packet which Lord Cobham had intercepted, promising that not one of the letters should be used except as Burghley thought fit, and hoping the Queen would conceive no ill of him.[1] When he received this letter, Burghley was unaware of the trick that had been played, but he was too cautious to fall readily into the net of the Bishop, and felt his way a little further.

He was dealing, on his Sovereign's behalf, for the safety of the kingdom, and against him were arrayed some of the subtlest minds of the age. His opponents shrank from nothing, not even from assassination; but Burghley, it must be admitted, met treachery by treachery, and proved himself cleverest in the disreputable game. Had Philip, or Alva, been troubled with a Queen of Scots, they would soon have removed the cause of discord; but political assassination does not commend itself to the English mind. In an age when intriguers shrank from no villainy, Englishmen never stooped to assassination. While they used spies, and inflicted torture, they avoided the dagger and the cup.

Charles Bailly was conveyed to the prison of the Marshelsea, in which a spy of Burghley's, named William Herlle, was also confined. This man, pretending to be suffering for political crimes, insinuated himself into the confidence of Bailly. Writing to Burghley an undated letter, Herlle informed him that a man named Charles, had been committed to the Marshalsea, who pretended to be a Brabanter

[1] Ross to Burghley, April 16.—*MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. VI., No. 39.

of Brussels, but who was really a Scot, and a minister of the Bishop of Ross. Herlle thought great things might be drawn from him if he was in close confinement. He was a dangerous fellow, and contained a whole mass of their secrets.[1]

On the 11th April, the spy wrote again. Touching Charles, he is the Scottish Queen's man. He pretends to be of the Low Countries, but is really a Scot. He speaks several languages, "yet easily deciphered," and is one of the most secret ministers of the Queen and the Bishop of Ross, a practiser in all their dealings in Flanders, where he has been nearly four years. He is very dear to his mistress, to the Bishop, and the Spanish Ambassador. He has dealt, and now deals with the rebels abroad, and with the Duke of Alva, and is privy with all their confederates on this side. Herlle heard that the writings Bailly brought over had been intercepted by Lord Cobham; but suggests he should be committed to close prison, and some secret token given to the keeper that Herlle might have access to him. Under pressure of the imprisonment Bailly will disclose any thing, for he is "fearful, full of words, glorious, and given to the cup, over whom I have already won some good degree."[2]

The confidence which Herlle had gained with Bailly he improved, and became the medium for conveying his letters to the Bishop of Ross. These he submitted to Burghley who copied them, but, being in a cipher, the key to which had not been

[1] Herlle to Burghley.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VI., No. 36.

[2] Anonymous [Herlle] to Burghley, 11th April.—*MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. VI., No. 37.

made out, they were of no immediate use. At length Bailly's suspicions were aroused, and his mouth was shut. He was removed to the Tower, and confined in a wretched dungeon without bed or furniture. Then he was racked, and after the rack another spy was set upon him, a spy pretending to be the Catholic convict Story, who advised him to counter-work Burghley, by offering to be a spy on the Bishop of Ross, but really to cheat the Secretary. Under this advice, and dreading another taste of the rack, Bailly gave up the key of the cipher; and Burghley, with its aid, read the letters to the Bishop, and learned all about the abstraction of the packet. The Bishop of Ross was at once placed under arrest, in the house of the Bishop of Ely, his papers were seized, and he himself was cross-questioned. Burghley thus became acquainted with some part of the conspiracy, but not with the whole. He knew from Bailly that aid had been asked from the Duke of Alva, and that the letters sent over had been received by the Bishop. There was enough to assure him that the help sought was intended for England, and not for Scotland; but as yet no Englishman was definitely mixed up in the disclosures.

Let us now return to Sheffield, and to the Queen of Scots. We left her at the end of March writing earnest appeals for the forwarding of the treaty, professing devotion to Elizabeth, and at the same time plotting an insurrection against her crown, and and arranging for a foreign invasion. When Dumbarton was taken, the knowledge that documents

had been found was scrupulously kept from her. The arrest of Bailly, and the examination of the Bishop of Ross, were also carefully concealed, and, beyond the fact that her custody was strict, nothing occurred to excite her suspicion. Elizabeth, the more effectually to keep her in the dark, wrote on the 12th April, offering plausible excuses for the delay of the treaty, but expressing her intention to continue it to some good end.[1]

Shrewsbury was fully on the alert, and asked Burghley to inform him of any practices for the lady's escape.[2] The precaution was no idle one, for Mary's friends, sanguine of the result of the dealings with Spain, were exercising all their ingenuity in devising plans for setting her at liberty. The Earl of Morton, on his return to Edinburgh, after the failure of the treaty negotiations, came across some of the schemes, and wrote on the 17th April to Lord Burghley, to put him on his guard.[3] Morton had heard of three projects for getting Mary out of Sheffield. "She would feign herself ill for two or three days, and then be taken down stairs to see the dancing. She was to dance herself, affect to faint, and be carried to her room. One of her women, dressed like her, would take her place on the bed, while she, in the disguise of a page, would escape from the postern. If this failed she was to go hunting, one of her ladies again representing her, and she again as page. A Scot was to come in post haste, with a pretended commission from Eliza-

[1] Elizabeth to Mary.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VI., No. 38.
[2] Shrewsbury to Burghley, April 1.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VI., No. 29.
[3] Morton to Burghley, April 17.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VI., No. 41.

beth to speak with her. He would address himself to the lady, who, when he retired, would direct the page to wait upon him. Or she would cut her hair, blot her face and body with filth as though she was a turn-broach in the kitchen, and so convey herself forth on foot to some place where horses should be provided for her."[1]

At Easter, a plot was concocted between Sir Henry Percy and the Bishop of Ross, for Mary's release. Burghley writing to Shrewsbury on the 19th October in the same year, says :—

"Beside Sir Thos. Stanley's enterprise, Sir Henry Percy, for whom I am right sorry, was a great devisor to have had her from you about Easter last, and the Bishop of Ross had before taken the measure of a window where she should have been letten down. Your change of her lodging altered the enterprise, whereat she was much offended. Powell also, the pensioner, who is this day sent to the Tower, was another enterpriser: One Raw, a servant of the Lord Lumley's, would also have stolen and carried her to a castle in Cleveland, in Yorkshire, of the Lord Lumley's: But in all their confessions it appeareth your strait keeping of her disappointed them. Of all these ye offenders confess that that Queen was always privy."[2]

Hickford, the secretary to the Duke of Norfolk, in his answer to the Council, 11th October 1571, says of a letter of the Bishop of Ross to the Duke of Norfolk, that it was "touching the Queen of Scots means of escape from my Lord Shrewsbury; how that she had made friends there in the house, and that she should escape thence, and all things were in readiness, both men and post-horses, to carry her into Sussex, whence she should be shipped into France, and that she only stayed upon under-

[1] Morton's letter condensed by *Froude*, v. 10, p. 187. [2] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 60.

standing of his (the Duke of Norfolk's) pleasure in the same."[1]

On the 18th of April, Elizabeth wrote to Shrewsbury that she had received particular intelligence from Scotland that the best of Mary's party there were expecting she would very shortly be conveyed into Scotland by some practice, and this intelligence was confirmed from other sources. Perhaps the visit of Mary's commissioners to Sheffield might be used as an occasion, when under disguise, as attendants, some persons might be found to execute such an enterprise. Elizabeth therefore warned him to be careful, without imparting any doubt to his charge, or to any of her people, and directed him at once to abridge her attendants, if the number increased above the ordinary.[2]

[1] "In the examination of Barker all that followeth is confessed by him upon the report of the B. of Ross.

"That Sir Hen. Percy had divers conferences with Owen and Powell, and also with the Bp. of Ross, for the taking away of the Scotch Queen.

"Item—at the last conference with the Bp. of Ross, Sir Henry was fully resolved to take the matter in hand, and bade the Bp. lay the plot well, for the doing of it, and he would execute it.

"Item—When the Bp. of Ross, Powell, and Owen, had talked together, they devised that the Scotch Queen should be let down out of a window with a man and a woman of her chamber in the night, and so should be secretly conveyed from place to place to a Castle in the North, where Sir Henry Percy should receive her, and from thence convey her into Scotland at the West Border.

"Item—that Sir Henry Percy told the Bp. of Ross that he would become the Scotch Queen's servant, and so shift for himself well enough.

"In the examination of the Bp. of Ross, it is confessed as followeth.

"The said Bp. doth confess that he had divers conferences with Powell and Owen, for the conveying of the Scotch Queen away.

"Item—he doth confess that he had conference with Sir Henry Percy twice in Lent last at one Hughes' house beside Bishops Gate in London, and that Sir Henry declared to him of the good will he bore to the Scotch Queen, and that then it was devised how the Scotch Queen might be conveyed out of a window in the night and so to be taken away.

"And to that enterprise Sir Henry offered to make six men with horses for his part, and said he durst not yet be a doer therein himself, but he would look through his fingers if she might escape, &c."—*In the hand of Sir Gilbert Gerrard, Attorney-General. Endd. by Burghley.* Contra Sir H. Percy, Dec. 1571.—*P.R.O. Domestic; Elizabeth*, v. 83, No. 40.

[2] Elizabeth to Shrewsbury.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VI., No. 42.

The Queen's warning came to Sheffield accompanied by a letter from Burghley, and both were answered by Shrewsbury on the 23rd April; the former "with so ill a hand," says the Earl, "as I doubt the will and resolution to her Highness to read." His Lordship was certainly an indifferent scribe, and a very bad speller, and when, as in this case, he dispensed with the services of a secretary, the result was a marvellously confused collection of blots and scratches. In the letter to Burghley Shrewsbury says:—

"He will look to his charge as safely as he can, and trusts to have her forthcoming. He will follow willingly Burghley's advice. The Q. of Scots seems to make small account of the loss of Dumbarton, nevertheless 'it toucheth her so near that she hath been very sickly ever since, and brooks little meat she takes.' She is still desirous to ride and go abroad daily. He restrains her sometimes, and she is greatly offended, and says that he has authority to remove her, and carry her abroad whither he pleases. He will reduce her number of attendants, of which he has good occasion by reason of the bruits about York, that she should be escaped. He heard of this to-night from Mr. Gargreave, who has received a letter from the Archbishop of York. He will use the occasion to look more surely to her if he can, which will bring a new conflict between them. He fears her falling into sickness by reason of the news that Tomme Carre brought her from Scotland last night, of the death of Bishop of St Andrew's, and that things do not go on there as well as she thought, 'which she frets herself inwardly at, though she bears a good face of it, and saith, though she hath by treason lost a heap of stones, yet she hath gotten the chiefest thing she looked for there, that is, the Castle and town of Edinburgh to be at her devotion, and that all her unfriends are put out of the town.' The Earl hears that sundry Scots, well horsed, are come to Doncaster on the way to London, but he fears them the less as they come with safe conduct from the

Marshal of Berwick. The Queen has never been so safely kept since he had her as now, and then he adds: 'My lord, I am an ill craver of money, but here is want thereof.' "[1]

The consequence of all these schemes for escape was, as we have seen, Shrewsbury's determination to keep his prisoner the more safely. Mary treated his precautions with lofty scorn, but he was not diverted from his purpose. In the presence of her attendants, and of his own, she asked Shrewsbury to give strict charge to his officers to have regard to the meat and drink delivered to her, as she had been warned to beware of poison. His answer was to restrict the liberty of her servants and reduce their number. On the 26th April, Shrewsbury approved and signed a series of new and stringent regulations for the government of the Queen of Scots' household. The document is preserved among the Cotton manuscripts, and a copy is in the Public Record Office. The Earl directs all the Scottish Queen's servants to leave her between nine at night and six in the morning. No servant but the Master of the Household to wear a sword, nor were more than four or five to carry bows, and none were to go out of the Castle without the Earl's special licence.[2]

Against these orders Mary at once remonstrated, through the Bishop of Ross, who forwarded to Lord Burghley a copy of the new regulations, together with the following complaints from his mistress:—

"Certain heads written by the Queen of Scotland to the

[1] Shrewsbury to Burghley, Sheffield, April 23.—*MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. VI., No. 46.
[2] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VI., No. 56, 1.

Bishop of Ross, her Highness' ambassador, to be shewn to the Queen's Majesty of England, and thereupon to obtain her Highness' answer.

"1. Declare the state of my person, how I have been lately vexed by sickness, with a great vomisement, first of pure blood, and after of congealed blood, flewme, and choler, the dolour of my side, &c., caused by daily augmentation of displeasure. It may bring about my death at length, which before the whole world will be laid upon the Queen and her councillors. Desire them to consider in what reputation it will bring this realm, and how honourable it would be if they caused me to be better treated. Purchase licence for the Earl of Shrewsbury to transport me to Bwkstons [Buxton's] Well for a few days, as I have written to Burghley by Mr. Lowret, physician.

"Desire licence to send to France for physicians who know my sickness better than any here.

"As it appears by the proceedings of this treaty, that the Queen intends to keep me perpetually here, desire for me honest liberty and treatment, for my health, with leave to travel in the country, hawk and hunt. I cannot sustain this hard treatment all my life, which would be shortened by it. If the Queen fears my escape, make sufficient offers for assurance that I will not.

"Desire leave for my officers and servants to serve me quarterly, changing one for another, as they have been used to do. Otherwise they cannot abide with me.

"Desire that their number be not so narrowly prescribed, but that it be 30, women excepted. I will require no more expense.

"Desire the Queen to write to Scotland that I may be paid my revenues, for my necessities and my servants' wages.

"Show how John Semple is troubled because he will not deliver my jewels to Lennox. Obtain licence for him to come here and give me account thereof, as they came to me from the King of France, and pertain not to Scotland. Require the French Ambassador to assist you in this.

"Declare how the wardens of the borders have refused to give passports to my servants, as though the treaty was broken. Know the Queen's pleasure therein.

"Require a safe conduct for Elizabeth Carmychaell and three servants, to go to Scotland to visit her husband and friends, and return."[1]

After restraining the liberty, the next step was to reduce the number of Queen Mary's attendants, and Shrewsbury, in sending to London the list of those who were to remain, and those who were to depart, says to Lord Burghley :—

"With much ado I have brought the Queen to lessen her people as near 30 as I can, not without weeping and tears. She has asked me to tolerate 9 persons above the 30, till she hears from the Bishop of Ross, and has promised that unless he has obtained the Queen's favour, they shall not tarry. I have agreed to give them the oversight for a time, and wish to know the Queen's pleasure. I send the names of those who are to go, and those who are to stay. The Bishop of Galloway wishes his eldest son to tarry, in hope to enter into credit with the Queen. Beton, her master of the household, and the rest of the papists about her, do not like it. The Bishop has written of this to you. Sheffield Castle, 4 May 1571."[2]

[1] *MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. VI., No. 56, II.—*Endd. in Cecil's hand*, 5 May 1571.

[2] *Holograph. MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VI., No. 57. Along with this letter the following documents were enclosed :—

"Endorsed by the Earl of Shrewsbury. The Queen of Scots' check-roll, given me by Beton the 4th of May, 1571.

1. My Lady Leinstoun, dame of honour to the Queen's Majesty.
2. Mistress Leinstoun.
3. Mistress Setoun.
4. Mistress Brusse.
5. Mistress Courcelles,
6. Mistress Kennett.
7. My Lord Leinstoun.
8. Mr. Betoun, master household.
9. Mr. Leinstoun, gentleman servant.
10. Mr. Castel, physician,
11. Mr. Raullett, secretary.
12. Bastien, page.
13. Balthazar Huylly.
14. James Lander.
15. Gilbert Courll.
16. William Douglas.
17. Jaquece de Sanlie.
18. Archibald Betoun.
19. Thomas Archebald.
20. D—— Chiffland.
21. Guyon l'Oyselon.
22. Andro Malreson.
23. Estien Hauet, escuyer.
24. Martin Huet, master cook.
25. Piere Madard, potiger.
26. Jhan du Boyes, pastilar.
27. Mr. Brusse, gentleman to my Lord Leinstoun.
28. Nicholl Fichar, servant to my Lady Leinstoun.
29. Jhon Dumfrys, servant to Mistress Setoun.
30. William Blake, servant to Mistress Courcelles; to serve in absence of Florence.

A curious and remarkable example of the insincerity that at this time pervaded all official life, is worthy of passing notice. A number of English seamen, formerly comrades of Sir John Hawkins, in his expeditions to the Spanish main, were suffering in a Spanish dungeon the tortures of the inquisition. Hawkins was anxious to procure their release, and made overtures to Philip, offering to play the traitor to his country if his comrades were set at liberty. He professed to be thoroughly dissatisfied with the ungrateful conduct of Elizabeth, and proposed to desert with half of her Majesty's fleet. One George Fitzwilliam was sent to Spain with these offers, and in order that he might make the better impression, was led to suppose that the offer he bore was sincere. Fitzwilliam, a genuine

Permitted of my Lord's benevolence.

Cristilie Hog, Bastiene's wife.
Ellen Bog, the master cook's wife.
Cristiane Grame, my Lady Leinstoun's gentlewoman.
Jannet Lindesay, Mistress Setoun's gentlewoman.
Jannette Spetelle.
Robert Hamiltoun, to bear fire and water to the Queen's kitchen.
Robert Ladie, the Queen's lacquay.
Gilbert Bonnar, horse keeper.
Francoys, to serve Mr. Castel the physician.

"At the Castle of Sheffield this 3 day of May, 1571.

"A. Galloway.
"De Betoun."

—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 52.

"*These are to depart.*

"The laird of Gartley and his servant, George Levingstoune, Sandy Bog, Sandy the Mr. Cooke's boy, gone to Scotland.

"Mr. Niniane Winzet, Scottish secretary; Angel Marie, perfumer; Guillaume le Seigneur, pantler; Giles le Royde, help to the somlier; John Bog, fruiterer; James Simpson, horse-keeper. These are going away by the Queen's command, and require their passports. (To Winzet's name is added a note in Shrewsbury's hand, saying that he is a priest, which he suspected at his first coming. If Burghley examine him, he will probably find that the Cardinal was privy to it.)

"John Levingstoune, Lady Levingstoune's lacquey; Tibault, Mr Levingstoune's boy; Thomas Shory, Mr. L.'s servant; Dawid, Bastien's boy; James Lawder's son.

"The rest of Lord Levingstoune's servants, four, go to Scotland with the Bp. of Galloway.

"If there are any other persons in the Castle or town, the Queen does not know of them."—*In a Scotch hand.—MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VI., No. 57, II.

Catholic conspirator, was made the mouth-piece of Sir John Hawkins, the sham traitor, who only wanted to dupe Philip, and thought he could do it most effectually by the use of an honest tool. Philip listened with some favour to the overture, and sent Fitzwilliam back, with an intimation that a letter of credit from the Queen of Scots would be deemed evidence of the sincerity of Hawkins. The Duke and Duchess of Feria, whom he waited upon, entrusted Fitzwilliam with letters and presents for the Queen of Scots, and, thus provided, he sought Sheffield. Some difficulty was experienced in gaining access to the Queen. Shrewsbury's guard was strict, and Fitzwilliam had no passports that he dare produce. In this dilemma Hawkins wrote to Burghley,[1] and Burghley furnished a permission for Fitzwilliam to see the Queen of Scots, on the ground that he had friends in a Spanish dungeon, and wished to procure Mary's good offices with Philip to secure their release. On receipt of this order Shrewsbury admitted Fitzwilliam "to the speech of this Queen." Mary "being somewhat doubtful at first to write, yet said she must pity prisoners, for that she was used as one herself, having all intelligence taken from her; yet she said she would do any pleasure she could to relieve any Englishman out of prison, and so hath written according to his request."[2] To her friend, the Duchess of

[1] John Hawkins to Burghley, May 13.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VI., No. 61.

[2] Shrewsbury to Burghley, June 3rd.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VI., No. 71.

Feria, Mary sent a book "with the old service in Latin," and in the end, wrote with her own hand,—

"Absit nobis gloriari nisi in cruce
Domini nostri Jesu Christi.

Maria R."[1]

Thus armed Fitzwilliam returned to Spain, and entered into a formal contract, on Hawkins' behalf, to have a fleet at sea to join the Duke of Alva in September. Philip, through his agent in England, paid about £40,000 to equip the vessels, set the English captives at liberty, granted Hawkins a pardon for his piracies in the Spanish main, and forwarded him a patent of nobility. Burghley gained the knowledge of the projected invasion, and used Philip's money to fit out ships to oppose him.

The name of Anthony Babington, of Dethick, is inseparably associated with the closing scenes of Queen Mary's life. His romantic attachment, his rash plot, and Mary's guilty complicity in his plans for the murder of Elizabeth, have rescued the name of a simple country gentleman from obscurity. It was in the midst of the Ridolfi conspiracy, that the first steps were taken that led to the linking together of the fate of Mary and Babington. On the 11th of May, 1571, the Earl of Shrewsbury wrote to Lord Burghley, saying: "Babington of Dethick is dead after a long sickness. He was my neighbour at Wingfield, holding of me his chief house, Dethick, by Knight's service." The Earl asks for the wardship of the youthful heir, saying he will give what Burghley thinks it is worth,

[1] Hawkins to Burghley, June 7th.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VI., No. 73.

and reminding him that this is his first request for a ward.[1] The petition was granted, and young Babington entered the household of the Earl. Ranking above menial servants, cadets of gentle birth were in the habit of attaching themselves to the families of the great nobles, where they acquired an education, not of books, but of men and manners. They saw life, learned manly exercises, were taught to obey, and prepared for the discharge of the duties that would devolve upon them in after life. Thus was Babington in Lord Shrewsbury's household, and it is not presuming too much to assume that while there he formed a chivalrous attachment to the beautiful and unfortunate prisoner, which ripened in after years into the famous Babington conspiracy.[2]

[1] *Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VI., No. 60.—The remainder of the letter is so characteristic of Mary's position and treatment at this time as to be interesting. Shrewsbury goes on to say: "The Queen is perplexed at not hearing oftener from the Bishop of Ross, and fears that he is not so well heard by the Queen and her Council, as he has been, which she marvels at and says that neither he nor she hath nor will deserve to be otherwise spoken of than well. Does not suffer George Douglas to remain any longer with his mistress who uses him friendly. They have had great conference together. Perceives he is loath to depart so soon. Gives him leave to lie in the town, which is better than his being in the house. A Scot named Boyd arrived here two days ago from Scotland with a passport from the Marshal of Berwick. Allowed him only to tarry two days, and will always do so, unless the time of their stay is mentioned on their passports. Has told the Queen so. Sheffield Castle, 11 May, 1571."—*Hol.* p. 1. *Add. Endd.*

[2] "The Babingtons of Dethick, in the parish of Ashover, claimed descent from Sir John Babington, Captain of Morlais in Brittany in the reign of Edward III., whose son Sir John Babington settled at Chilwell, Co. Derby, and became, by Benedicta daughter and heiress of Simon Ward, Co. Cant., father of Thomas B., who married Isabella daughter and heiress of Robert Dethick of Dethick, 25 Henry VI. (1446), and thus acquired the Dethick estates. John B., son of this Thomas married Isabel, daughter of Henry Bradborne of Hogh, Co. Derby, who died 1486, and he was killed at the Battle of Bosworth, 1485, leaving a son Thomas Babington of Dethick, who married Editha, d. of Raff Fitzherbert of Norbury, and died 13 March 1518. Thomas was succeeded by his son Sir Anthony Babington, who married for his first wife Elizabeth, daughter and co-heir of John Ormond, of Alfreton and Norton, by Joan his wife, daughter and h. of William Chaworth, Knight. By this lady Anthony Babington became Lord of a moiety of the Manor of Norton, Co. Derby, thus:—John Ormond, who died 1507, left three daughters co-heiresses, (1) Elizabeth, m.

George Douglas, referred to in Shrewsbury's letter of May 11th, was one who planned unsuccessfully for the Queen's escape from the fortress of Lochleven, a feat afterwards accomplished by the orphan boy, Willie Douglas. The object of his visit to Sheffield, and the subject of the conferences, we learn from a letter of the Queen to the Archbishop of Glasgow. Douglas had been under some suspicion. His salary had been stopped, a very trying position for a young man about to be married, and he was anxious to reinstate himself in his mistress's good opinion. He explained the cause of the misunderstanding,

Anthony Babington of Dethick, ob. 1505; (2) Ann, wife of William Mering, who died without issue; (3) Joanna, wife of Thomas Denham of Eythorpe. In the 12th Henry VIII., the Court at Norton was held in the names of Lady Joanna Denham, widow; Anthony Babington, Esq., and Lady Ann Merying, dowager. Anthony Babington is styled knight, 27th Henry VIII. The issue of the marriage of Anthony Babington with Elizabeth Ormond was, inter alia, Thomas Babington of Dethick, who died 3 Elizabeth. He married Katherine, daughter of Sir Henry Sacheverel, and had issue Henry B. of Dethick, who m. for his second wife Mary, d. of George, Lord Darcy, who married 2ndly George Foljambe of Barlborough, and Edward who married Margaret, dau. of G. Zouch of Codnor. Henry of Dethick was the father, by his wife Mary, of Anthony Babington, the conspirator, Francis B. and George B. On the 20th Feb., 8th Elizabeth, Henry Babington covenanted with John Lord Darcy, of Aston, Co. York, to levy a fine before the feast of the nativity of St John the Baptist next ensuing, to the said Lord Darcy and Sir Thomas Metham, of the moiety of the Manor of Norton, among other lands. In 1585, 20 May, Anthony Babington, perhaps in view of the treasons he was then contemplating, conveyed one half of Norton Hall, with one half of various lands mentioned by name, to John Bullock, of Darley, Esq., for £400, but does not dispose of the moiety of the Manor. In 1587, 27 July, after the execution of Anthony Babington, Francis B. of Kingston, Co. Notts, and George B. of Dethick, brothers of the late Anthony, convey to Anthony Blyth of Brichet one half part of the Manor of Norton for £190. Anthony the conspirator, married Margery, daughter of John Drascott, of Paynsley. The estate of Henry Babington, who died in the reign of Elizabeth, was very great, and so descended to his son Anthony. What contributed principally to aggrandise this branch of the family were the two marriages referred to above, one with the heiress of Dethick, and the other with the heiress of John Ormond, who brought them a share of the Chaworth property. A tolerable list of the estate as it stood 8th Elizabeth may be seen in Dr. Thoroton, p. 9. After Anthony's attainder a great part of the property was forfeited; and, moreover, Francis, his next brother, proved very unthrifty, which gave the finishing touch to the opulence of this line. According to a Derbyshire map, made in 1598, there were Babingtons still at Dethick, though this was after the attainder of Anthony. The will of Thomas Babington, grandfather of Anthony, dated 10 Nov., 1558, is said to be very curious. The hall at Dethick was taken down in William III.'s time, and the wainscot removed to Mr. Wollam's house at Glapwell."—*The above information is derived from Pegge's MSS. in the College of Arms.*

declared his desire to serve the Queen of Scots as long as he lived; and the Queen not only listened favourably to his excuses and justifications, but gave orders for his salary to be paid quarterly as usual. She begged the Archbishop of Glasgow, her ambassador at Paris, to interest himself in bringing about the marriage, so long contemplated, between George Douglas and La Verrière, and to pay 25,000 francs down, and the remainder of an amount not mentioned, by yearly instalments. To raise the ready money it might be needful to compromise a law-suit for which the Queen was formerly offered, at the first word 40,000 francs; but still, though she made some sacrifice, her promise to Douglas must be fulfilled—a debt, which the services he had rendered, imposed on his grateful mistress.[1]

On the same day Mary wrote a letter to Queen Elizabeth, sending it by the hand of Douglas, soliciting for him permission to pass into Scotland, "where," she says, "he has some effects which I gave him before my imprisonment by the late Earl of Murray, and some other things which may belong to him. I pray you to command the Earl of Lennox and his adherents to permit him to have, and to hold [them], freely and without obligation or constraint."[2] Thus Douglas was dismissed, to be busied about his matrimonial prospects and his mistress's affairs; and while he is so occupied we will once more turn out of these bye-paths of our story into the broad avenue of the main events.

[1] Mary to Archbishop of Glasgow, May 13th, 1571.—*Strickland*, v. 1, p. 213, where the letter is erroneously dated 1570.

[2] *Labanoff*, v. 3, p. 275.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE time at length came when, in the opinion of Elizabeth and her ministers, it was desirable to inform the Queen of Scots of the detention of her ambassador, and the discovery of her plots. On the 14th of May, the Queen wrote to the Earl of Shrewsbury, directing him to tell the Queen of Scots that the Bishop of Ross had lately attempted by sundry practices, with rebels and fugitives beyond the sea, and others, to move new troubles in England, and stir up rebellion. The proofs against the Bishop were probable both by his own letters and by witnesses. In consequence of this, his liberty had been restrained, and he was no longer treated as an ambassador, but he would not—and on this point the instructions were positive—he would not be charged, nor enquiry made about anything done in the service of the Queen of Scots as her ambassador.[1] This letter was accompanied by another, and a longer one from Lord Burghley, which ran as follows :—

"It may please your L.

"Besides some things written in the Queen's Majesty's letters, her pleasure is that I should certify and advertise you of these things following. We find that of late one Ridolfi, an Italian

[1] Elizabeth to Shrewsbury, 14th May.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VI., No. 62.

merchant, was by the Bishop of Ross sent to the Duke of Alva, and so to pass to the Pope, and then into Spain; and that before his going there was a secret conspiracy here by the said Bishop with two Lords, to us yet unknown, for a new rebellion this summer: Since, also, we know that Ridolfi wrote letters from Brussels to the Bishop of Ross, signifying that the Duke of Alva liked well of the purpose; he wrote also to the two Lords at the same time to move them to continue their purpose: All these were written in cipher, and the two letters to the Lords were also endorsed with several marks, and the Bishop was willed to deliver the one letter to 30, and the other to 40. Now the Bishop being examined, denyeth not the sending of Ridolfi to Flanders, to Rome, and to Spain; nor the receiving of letters from him in cipher; nor the receiving of two letters, the one to be delivered to 30 the other to 40; but he sayeth that the figure 40 was meant for the Queen of Scots, and the figure 30 for the Spanish Ambassador; and that the Queen of Scots did write by Ridolfi to the Duke of Alva, to the Pope, and to the King of Spain; but he saith it was partly for money, partly for aid against her rebels: But still the Queen's Majesty is acertened by good proof that the letters 30 and 40 were to two Lords of England; for it was written in them that they should march with their power towards London, and that the Duke of Alva would send power to a port to join with the two Lords.

"Now, the Queen's Majesty will have your Lordship speedily to speak with that Queen before any messenger can come from the Bishop of Ross, and move her (as she will look for any favour at the Queen's Majesty's hand, or will appear to her Majesty to mean truly), that she will answer these questions.

"What letters she wrote by Ridolfi, and to whom and to what purpose; and to show you presently the copies of those letters.

"Secondly, to declare what letters she hath received from Ridolfi whilst he was lately in the Low Countries, and how they were written, whether in cipher or not; and to show your Lordship those letters.

"Again, to show your Lordship whether in any cipher to her known now remaining with the Bishop of Ross she is named

by the figure 30, or 40; and what superscription was upon the letter of Ridolfi to her; for we understand that Ridolfi did but make a mark upon those letters.

"You shall require to know in what manner of cipher Ridolfi did write to her, and you shall desire to see the alphabet of that cipher, and shall require only the characters, without any explication or signification of them; for we here do know in what cipher the said letters of 30 and 40 were written, but the Bishop sayeth they were in an Italian cipher, which is false. All these things her Majesty would have you earnestly demand, and if the Bishop say truth then she can declare the same; but your Lordship shall not, until she have fully denied all, say anything of the Bishop's answers. Hereof I pray your Lordship send answer by this bearer.

"Furthermore, we have great cause to have one John Cobbard, a Scottishman, a servant of the Bishop of Ross, taken: We hear that he departed from hence 20 days past: If by any means your Lordship can get him, let him be taken and sent up secretly. The Queen's Majesty liketh well of all your orders, and can be content that (if yourself shall be so content), the number above 30 permitted to be with that Queen by your Lordship shall remain. If the Queen of Scots be offended with the restraint of the Bishop, certainly you may say that the whole Council have found his practices against the Queen's Majesty so evident, and, for the more part, now confessed by himself, that they all have fully and earnestly determined to proceed against him sharply; and that it is not the particular displeasure of any towards that Queen, or towards him. And thus I end scribbling, in great haste. 14 May 1571.

"Your L. at co.

"W. Burghley."

"To the right honourable my very good L. the Earl of Shrewsbury."

The receipt of these missives threw a new light on the state of things, as seen from the seclusion of Sheffield. Waiting in hope was no longer possible for the Queen. The plot was clearly out;

all her nicely laid plans spoiled, and her anticipations of help by invasion dissipated. She did not, however, despair, but felt her way cautiously. On hearing the contents of the letters, says Shrewsbury, "she was at first troubled, and with a few tears, said that she for a long time expected to hear of some quarrel being laid on the Bishop for her sake. In the end she seemed well pacified, and protested with many good words her great good will to your Majesty. She then very quietly answered Burghley's questions as I have written to him."[1]

Her answers were these:—

"1. She has not written any letters by any man named Ridolfi, to any person or persons for any purpose, nor kept copies of any letters since she was searched at Tutbury. 2. She never received any letters from Ridolfi, during his late being in the Low Countries, nor at any other time, in cipher or otherwise, nor has any cipher in which Ridolfi ever wrote to her. 3. Does not remember any cipher with the Bishop of Ross, in which she is named 30 or 40. If any such were, she would not disclose it, or make her writing known, because it might concern the causes of herself and country.

"Shrewsbury first wrote out Burghley's articles and showed them to her, and then wrote her answer, whereof she took notes. Did this, he says, lest any doubt or denial might happen hereafter. He asked her if she had written any letter to the Pope, or any other foreign prince. She answered, that since the end of her treaty, being without hope of aid or support here, she had written to all foreign princes, her friends, for aid against her rebels, but never against the Queen or her realm. She would not acknowledge when she sent those letters, nor by whom. She says no man has authority to examine her so far, and she well knows 'the Bishop of Ross hath at no time practised

[1] Shrewsbury to Elizabeth, May. 18.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VI., No. 66.

or done to any other end.' Shrewsbury could not perceive that she had any intelligence from the Bishop of Ross before he spoke with her, though he believes it to be so, as her people are daily abroad in every village and corner to collect news. It would not be amiss, he suggests, to restrain them; their liberty is too great. She has lately sent her footman with Douglas to London. If he is met with in time, knowledge may be gained of farther practices, for he returns, as Shrewsbury thinks, not without letters. If John Cobbard can be met with he will send him to you. Sheffield Castle, 10th May, 1571."[1]

The French Ambassador plied Elizabeth with entreaties and remonstrances, and received evasive answers. Mary, as usual, was her own worst enemy. Professing fairly, she was playing false, and so furnished Elizabeth with any excuse she might need for the harshest treatment. Submissive before Shrewsbury, Mary's pen was busy writing to the French Ambassador, and to the Archbishop of Glasgow, denouncing the Queen of England, and imploring vengeance upon her. Elizabeth's intentions, she said, were sinister. She desired to obtain the kingdom of Scotland, and kept Mary only to forward that design. Mary's life she would take at once, if that would help on the matter; but the Prince was in the way. Such was the strain in which the Queen of Scots wrote to her confidential advisers. She had disclaimed all intention of claiming the crown of England during Elizabeth's life, and in the face of this assurance Burghley's persistent demand for the ratification of the Treaty of Leith looked like needless precaution. But it was not needless, as these letters show; and Mary

[1] Shrewsbury to Burghley.—*Holograph, p.* 2. *Add. Endd.—MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VI., No. 65.

openly avers to the Archbishop of Glasgow that Elizabeth possesses the crown "against all right, Divine and human."[1] We may estimate, from this assertion, the measure of Mary's sincerity when pledging herself not to disturb Elizabeth, and to submit to her guidance in all things.

The Queen of Scots was struggling at this time against great bodily weakness. Shrewsbury wrote on Whit-Sunday night, the 3rd of June, that she had been sick for two or three days past. On the previous Friday she swooned three or four times, so that her people were afraid, and, though better on Whit-Sunday, she was still weak.[2] Believing the sickness arose more from mental anxiety than from physical causes, Shrewsbury advised his captive "to put her whole affiance in her Majesty, and no other, and to give over all her practices, if she dealt in any, for truth sought no couriers." In her letter to the Archbishop of Glasgow, Mary said she felt her indisposition so much that she did not expect to be able to remain long where she was, being captive, and at the mercy of griefs and annoyances; yet she did not take Shrewsbury's advice, but continued her practices and perpetuated her troubles.[3]

By this time Ridolfi was at Madrid, urging his suit, pleading for an invasion of England, and assuring Philip how easily Elizabeth might be dis-

[1] *Labanoff*, v. 3, p. 286.

[2] Shrewsbury to Burghley, June 3.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VI., No. 71.

[3] Mary's letters to La Mothe and to the Archbishop of Glasgow—*Labanoff*, v, 3, pp. 294, 306, 313, 317, &c.—may be referred to by those who would see, more in detail, those expressions of her views which amply justify the statements in the text.

posed of. Philip spoke of his zeal in the cause of the Queen of Scots, but he distrusted the envoy, and did nothing. With his Council, however, the King of Spain talked over plans of assassinating Elizabeth, and listened to the schemes of one Chapin Vitelli; and though nothing came of it, it was not because Philip entertained any scruples about the crime of murder.[1]

In June, the negotiations for a marriage between the Queen of England and the youthful Duke of Anjou were in their most prosperous stage. To Burghley and Walsingham such a marriage appeared to be the best way out of the many embarrassments of the political situation, but it was not popular with the people. When Burghley mentioned the project to Shrewsbury, the Earl clearly disliked the idea, but hesitated to say so. He replied that he could say little touching the marriage, but would daily pray God to bless her Majesty."[2]

Shrewsbury was vigilant as ever, wholly occupied, as he says, about the greatest affairs; and when the Council sent him an intimation to look after Francis Rolleston of Lea, in the parish of Ashover, he at once, apprehended the man, and threw him into confinement at Wingfield, awaiting further orders. Shrewsbury found Rolleston in his house at Lea, with no other company but his wife. He had just returned from London, sick of an ague, and unable to travel without great peril. In Wingfield, he was separated from his wife and friends, and shut

[1] Ridolfi to the Queen of Scots, Paris, Sept. 30.—*MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. VII., No. 48.
[2] Shrewsbury to Burghley, June 9.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VI., No. 74.

up from conference, under the charge of persons appointed by Shrewsbury for the purpose.[1] Four days later, Shrewsbury wrote again. Further information had led him to think Rolleston was dissembling sickness, and by abstinence would become weak. Therefore he sent him at once to the Council to be dealt with as should be seen fit.[2]

Active as Shrewsbury was, the ministers of Elizabeth did not trust implicitly to his reports, but placed spies about him, to observe the proceedings of the Queen of Scots. Even the Earl's secretary, John Bateman, was in private correspondence with Burghley, but he could detect no weak point in the carefulness of his master. Writing to Burghley from Chatsworth, on the 6th August, he says, he has perceived nothing of moment since his last communication by the hand of Carpenter, except that he hears Lord Livingstone and his wife will shortly depart to Scotland, at which the Queen is not a

[1] Shrewsbury to Burghley, from Sheffield, 9th June.—*Holograph.*—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VI., No. 74.

[2] Shrewsbury to Burghley, from Sheffield, 13th June.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VI., No. 75. Mr. J. C. Cox, in his "Churches of Derbyshire," v. I, p. 25, says:—"The family of Rolleston came from Rolleston in Staffordshire. In the fourteenth century, a younger son of Sir Ralph Rolleston purchased the Manor of Lea from the Frechevilles. Shortly afterwards, William Rolleston married a daughter of Roger de Wynfield, of Edelstow Hall; and by this alliance his great grandson, James Rolleston, eventually became also entitled to the Old Hall Manor, one of the four Manors into which Ashover was divided. The two Manors of Lea and Old Hall remained in the family till the latter end of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, when this branch of the Rolleston's became extinct, and the estates passed to the Pershalls, of Horsley, Stafford." In Ashover Church there formerly existed a large alabaster stone bearing the portraiture of a man and his wife, and at their feet the following inscription: "Hic jacet corpora Francisci Rolleston armigeri et Marie uxoris ejus, filie Johis Vernon militis, qui paldictus Franciscus obiit iij. die Augusti Anno Dni 1587. Et predicta Maria obiit . . . die . . . ." Mr. Cox says the Francis Rolleston commemorated by this slab, would be the son of Thomas Rolleston and Agnes Turville, and grandson of James Rolleston, whose monument is in the chancel at Ashover. He is also the Francis Rolleston whose arrest was reported by the Earl of Shrewsbury. The Manor of Lea is now the property of the Nightingales, a house rendered illustrious by the noble philanthropy of Florence Nightingale.

little troubled. She seems willing to have the Bishop of Galloway about her, but Beaton, her master of the household, Rollett, her secretary, and Thomas Livingstone, being all stiff Papists, are against it. The Queen will not have any Protestant follow her causes, for fear, as she says, of losing her friends. She professes to have committed herself and her son to the protection of the French King, and it appeared to Bateman that she had received some French comfort by letters or intelligence, but she was still troubled in mind. "She says, she will use what means she can, to help herself, meaning certainly among other things to escape if she can, saying she had rather lose her life than lead this life." Hereupon, says Bateman, he doubts not Burghley will provide against practices and "suddens."[1]

Writing again on the 17th August, this time from Sheffield, Bateman says:—

"My lord [Shrewsbury], hearing of some unquietness intended by Lancashire men, is more vigilant and doubtful of his charge here, looking to her almost hourly, and keeping all who come from speaking to her, except in his presence. He has ordered to-day that all the woods and moors within [2] miles shall be walked and watched, and information sent to him of suspected persons resorting thither. Similar order has been sent to divers towns. The watch and ward here is made stronger with shot. Whenever she walks out of the door, certain soldiers are sent before, to see and keep all places clear. These things have been carefully devised and put in order by his Lordship's own self. He knows what manner of man Makinson is, and has kept him from talking with her, or any belonging

[1] Bateman to Burghley, Aug. 6.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VII., No. 3.
[2] Left blank.

to her, whereat she is much offended, and Makinson much disquieted, seeming disappointed of the chief matter of which he had to inform her. Sheffield, 17th Aug., 1571." [1]

Shrewsbury explains that Makinson was the bearer of letters from the Bishop of Ross to the Queen of Scots. In a letter to Burghley, dated 17th August, he says:—

"I have received your letters by Makinson, permitting him only to see the Queen of Scots in my presence. She is offended, but her offence shall not hinder me from doing my duty. I know Makinson, and therefore kept him from her. He brought letters from the Bishop of Ross, which I read before they were given to her. They contained his discourse of the late talk between the Council and him. Would have returned them, if there had been any matter of importance. The Bishop enclosed a letter from your Lordship to him, which he wished returned. She said that she would write her mind to the French Ambassador. I offered to enclose her letters in my packet to you that they might be delivered as should please the Queen; whereat she was grieved, and said, that she perceived by the Bishop's letters that he had not received the letters she wrote by the last messenger, and sent in my packet. She thought these might be used in the same way, and therefore commanded Rollett, her secretary, to read them secretly to Makinson in my sight, that if they are kept from the Ambassador, he might declare to him the heads thereof. This letter is enclosed. She also charged Makinson to desire the Ambassador to declare to Mons. le Mote that she thought by Monsieur's coming that she would have been better treated, but she finds it rather worse; if she is thus used, she trusts the King her brother will look to it; if he do not, she must charge him with the League and Ancient Alliance, which shall not be broken on her part. Sheffield, 17 Aug., 1571." [1]

John Gordon, a supernumerary servant of the Scotch Queen, in his appeal to Burghley, shows

[1] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VII., No. 22.—*Hol. p.* 1. *Add. Endd.*

[2] *Signed, p.* 1. *Add. Endd.—MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VII., No. 23.

the character of the restrictions at this time used. His letter is dated "Sheffield, 9th August, 1571," and is addressed to Lord Burghley. He says:—

"My father, before departing hence, wrote to ask you that I, your scholar, might have licence to remain with the Queen of Scotland, my sovereign and good mistress. Shrewsbury made the same request for me. My father, at his departure, left me under Shrewsbury's protection and yours. I peaceably enjoyed my abode here, till his new restraint, which is so hard, that although I never was of the Queen's number, but only tolerated of grace, my grace of remaining is forfeited without my desert. I never did anything to be blamed during my abode here. Since my arrival in England, I take your honour to witness that I have never dealt in anything otherwise than is allowed. Am much bound to your honour for the courtesy shown to me at all times. Crave humbly your honor's help to be restored to the Queen. Cannot go to my own country, unless I would wittingly run into the slaughter-house, for I am put to the horn, forfeited of life and goods. The copy of Mr. Randell's letter will show you part thereof. Is altogether destitute of friends in England, except your honor, next to the Earl of Shrewsbury. The book which Mr. Randell alleges that I have written against the adversaries of the Queen, my mistress, in Latin and Scotch, is against rebellion in general. It is not finished. When it is, will send a copy, and submit to your judgement, and that of all the Universities in Germany and England. Asks Burghley to have pity upon his desolate and doleful estate. Sheffield, 9 Aug. 1571."[1]

Gordon was a Protestant, "a very learned young man, of an amiable disposition, and related to many worthy persons."[2] Mary declares him to have been a faithful servant to her, and she had some hopes of his conversion. Failing in his suit to be allowed to remain near her person, Mary sent

[1] *Hol. Endd.* 9th September, 1571.—*MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. VII., No. 5.

[2] Mary to Archbishop of Glasgow.—*Labanoff*, v. 3, p. 358.

him, on the 18th September, with letters and commendations to the Archbishop of Glasgow, at Paris.

Meanwhile the threads of the great plot were being unravelled by Lord Burghley and his spies. Little by little they traced all the windings of the tortuous work, and, at last, fortune threw into their hands evidence fixing the Duke of Norfolk with his share of the affair, and showing that notwithstanding his promises to Elizabeth, he was still dealing in the Queen of Scots' causes. Two thousand crowns had been sent from France for Mary Stuart's use, and the Duke of Norfolk, receiving it from the French Ambassador, was forwarding £600, in gold, to his agent in the town of Shrewsbury, with directions to pass it on to Scotland, for Lethington and Grange. The bearer of the money was told that the bag contained silver. For some reason he opened it, and found gold, together with a letter in cipher. The discovery was laid before Burghley, and the secret was out. Norfolk was belying his promise, and when his house was searched, other papers of a compromising nature were discovered. He was at once put under arrest, and on the 5th September removed again to the Tower.

Let us see how these events reflected themselves in Sheffield. Shrewsbury had been busying himself in August with the Popish tendencies of some of his neighbours. The proceedings of his aunt, the old Countess of Northumberland, who had many notorious Papists about her, disturbed him. The Countess was of great age, "both impotent and of no ability to govern herself, or any other;

but, like a child, led and abused to Popery, and such dangerous inconveniences, by such as be about her."[1] So Shrewsbury informed the Privy Council. He found that her house was a principal place where Francis Rolleston, who had just been apprehended; John Hall, the enterpriser for Mary's escape the year before; John Reull, and others, had met in their traitorous practices. Wentworth too, of Wentworth, was an earnest Papist, of wit and ability, able to work inconvenience, and Shrewsbury had ascertained that a few days before the Northern rebellion, the Earl of Northumberland and his wife lay certain days at Wentworth, under colour of hunting, when it was devised that the Countess should come disguised like a nurse to Bastian's wife, then in child-bed at Wingfield, and the Queen of Scots, being something like her, would have been conveyed away in her apparel.[2] Shrewsbury's remonstrances with the Countess of Northumberland proved unavailing, for the people about her were resolute Papists.[3] Writing on the 11th

[1] Shrewsbury to Privy Council, August 19th.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VII., No. 24.

[2] Shrewsbury to Burghley, Aug. 13.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VII., No. 12.—Wentworth of Wentworth at this time was Thomas Wentworth who married Margaret, daughter and heir of William Gascoigne of Gawthorpe. He died 14th February, 1587, and was buried at Wentworth. He was grandfather of Thomas, Earl of Strafford.

[3] On the 4th Oct. Shrewsbury writes to Burghley:—

"Hearing last night that the old Lady of Northumbertand would privily remove this morning with her household to Shropshire, and with the pretence of going to the Earl of Pembroke, whereas her full purpose was to remain at one of Sir Thomas Fitzherbert's houses in Staffordshire; thought it best to stay her this morning in the Queen's name, till her Majesty's pleasure were further known. The more unwilling I saw her, the more earnest I was, though with quiet manner, and as gentle words as I could use, offered that if she wished change of air for her health, or lacked any necessary, she should have any house or commodity I had. Would do anything for her health or comfort of mind. Thought it good also to take order by attendance of some of my servants, that she shall be kept from the resort of suspected persons, who still

September to Burghley, he says, "Francis Wortley, and her [the Countess's] servants, not contented that she should live in good order and obedience to the laws, have, by sinister practises, persuaded her to leave her house and go to Wortley, his mother's house, a solitary place, where none resort but Papists. Wortley's mother is known to be a naughty Papist." [1]

seek to abuse her impotent age, to the contempt of her Highness' proceedings. She is not yet brought to take the communion, and uses no Divine service in her house. Though her example is intolerable, I trust no great inconvenience will ensue as long as she remains where I can keep my eye upon her, and those who resort to her. But harm may grow from her being at other parts further off, as at Sir Thomas Fitzherbert's, where the worst kind of people may unknown have conference, and receive comfort in their practices.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VII., No. 49.—*Signed p.* 2. *Add. Endd.*

[1] Wortley, near Sheffield, a place that at that time might very justly be termed "solitary," for it stood in the midst of Wharncliffe Chase, and was all but inaccessible by roads. Wortley was still a lonely place two hundred years afterwards. Horace Walpole, writing to Richard Bentley from Wentworth Castle, August 1756, says:—"Old Wortley Montague lives on the very spot where the Dragon of Wantley did, only I believe the latter was much better lodged; you never saw such a wretched hovel; lean, unpainted, and half its nakedness barely shaded with harateen stretched till it cracks. Here the miser hoards health and money, his only two objects; he has chronicles in behalf of the air, and battens on Tokay, his single indulgence, as he has heard it is particularly salutary. But the savageness of the scene would charm your Alpine taste; it is tumbled with fragments of mountains, that look ready laid for building the world. One scrambles over a huge terrace, on which mountain ashes and various trees spring out of the very rocks; and at the brow is the den, but not spacious enough for such an inmate. However, I am persuaded it furnished Pope with this line, so exactly it answers to the picture:

'On rifted rocks, the dragon's late abodes.'

I wanted to ask if Pope had not visited Lady Mary Wortley here during their intimacy, but could one put that question to *Avidien* himself."—*Horace Walpole's Letters*, ed. 1840, v. 3, p. 237.—Even as late as the time of the first Lord Wharncliffe, the roads were so bad that wheeled carriages traversed them with difficulty. When Mr. Wortley (afterwards created Lord Wharncliffe) came from London, he used to write to his tenants to meet him at Sheffield with their teams, to draw himself and his baggage up the hill to Grenoside. In the reign of Henry VII., a royal mandate took a month to travel from London to Wortley.

Francis Wortley of Wortley was nine years old in 1543, when his father, Thomas Wortley died, leaving a widow, Margaret, daughter of Sir John Savile, of Tankersley, who afterwards married Richard Corbet. Francis Wortley married in 1558, for his first wife, Mary, daughter and co-heir of Robert Swift, of Rotherham and Broomhall, steward of the Earl of Shrewsbury. At the date of the transactions mentioned in the text, Wortley was 37 years of age, and his mother must have been still living. He was not in such favour with the authorities as he afterwards became, when, in 1582, he was a member of the Council of the North, and Shrewsbury thought him "a gentleman both wise and of very good credit in the country," and able to take charge of the Queen of Scots while Shrewsbury was absent in London.

To return, however, to the effect produced on the inmate of the Castle at Sheffield, by the discovery of her practices, Norfolk was taken to the Tower on the 5th September, and on the same day Burghley wrote to Shrewsbury from Horeham, near Thaxted, where the Court then was, telling him of the discovery of the Duke's treachery, and adding:—

"Upon these considerations her Majesty thinketh it most necessary that you be now circumspect over your charge, for beside these things above said there are discovered plainly that the Duke hath had a continual intelligence with that Queen, contrary to that which I thought he meant; and as I am sorry that it is so, so am I glad that it is discovered."[1]

No sooner did this intelligence reach Sheffield, than Shrewsbury took steps to carry out both the letter and the spirit of Burghley's advice. He became more than ever "circumspect," and in obedience to instructions that either accompanied or immediately followed the letter, proceeded to dismiss all the servants that had been allowed to remain about the Queen, over and above the prescribed number of thirty. Orders had several times been given for the reduction of her retinue, and changes had been made to that end, but by favour of the Earl, Mary had usually managed, after the outburst of rigour had spent itself, gradually to transgress the official bound. The time for rigour had again come, and Shrewsbury proceeded to discharge his duty. The Queen "showed herself exceeding sorrowful," as she had done many times before, "when she heard that some of her servants would be removed, and seemed to despair of the continuance of her life." But new difficulties

[1] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 56.

as well as old ones met the Earl. When he ordered the supernumeraries to depart, the whole train showed a readiness to go "upon policy," as Shrewsbury says, "to have had the others still to remain with them, alleging that they would not, nor could not serve without them."[1] They attempted, in fact, something very like a strike. If they could not all remain, none would remain, and thus they thought to put pressure on the Earl to keep them. But he proved equal to the occasion, though he admits it gave him more trouble than he had ever had in one day. He named those who were to remain, as well as those who were to go, and, by way of compromise, allowed ten of the supernumeraries to stay "till the Queen's further pleasure was known." Mary wrote a vigorous remonstrance to Elizabeth, complaining of her hard treatment, and of her illness; denying that she had given any cause for suspicion. This letter she proposed sending by the hand of Lord Livingstone, but Shrewsbury refused to let him go, and the Queen was compelled to be content with a messenger of the Earl's choosing. Lady Livingstone, who had been ill for eight weeks, was anxious to depart as soon as she could, and as Elizabeth had no ground of complaint against either her or her husband, Lord Shrewsbury received instructions "to use them favourably, that they may at their commodity depart when they shall desire."[2]

[1] Shrewsbury to Burghley.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VII., No. 40.

[2] Burghley to Shrewsbury.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 58.—The following letter is preserved in the British Museum, Caligula, c. iii., 185:—

Shrewsbury to [Elizabeth.]

"According to your Highness' letters of the 5th, I have declared to the Queen the discovery of the unlawful intelligence and practices between the

A man named Robinson, a servant of the Bishop of Ross, who arrived in Sheffield with letters from his master, and the French Ambassador, was treated with less consideration. His letters were at once seized and sent to London, and he was "committed to sure keeping," awaiting further orders. His place of imprisonment was "a house in the town," and one Tuesday, being market-day, when Sheffield was at its busiest, he "hung out a glove from his chamber window, in a scornful and malicious sort, that the comers might know him to be a prisoner, or perhaps as a sign of some other lewd intention."[1] He was at once deprived of the

Duke of Norfolk and her, and of her deliberation for escape; and that the cause of your offence is your knowledge of her labour to stir up a new rebellion, with the aid of the King of Spain.

"She answered that as for the Duke, he hath to answer for his own doings. 'I have not,' saith she, 'dealt with him since the time of his restraint, nor used any moyaunce unto him; neither have I gone about to stir up a rebellion in this realm, nor intended any harm to the Queen or any her subjects; although,' saith she, 'the Queen hath maintained my rebels against me, to the taking away of my crown from my h[ead].' Thus by her words she thought to seem clear, though her deeds are discovered to the contrary. But urging my former sayings t[o] be certainly true, I said, that seeing she had so used herself, your Majesty had just cause to alter your courteous dealing, as well in restraining her liberty, as also in taking away such number of perso[ns] from her as are meet rather for practise than for service necessary; and told her roundly, therefore, that all above the number of xvj.* persons must depart from her, and that with speed. At this she was exceedingly troubled, weeping and sorrowing, and said that now she looked shortly that her life should end. 'For thus doth the Queen use me,' saith she, 'to that purpose; yet I desire,' saith she, 'that some good learned man may be with me before my death, to comfort and stay my conscience, being a Christian woman; and the world shall know,' said she, 'that I died a true prince, and in the Catholic faith that I profess.' I said unto her that she had not cause to use any such words, nor to think any evil of your Majesty, that had always so courteously dealt with her above her deserts; and I called then earnestly for her check roll, and demanded whom she would choose to the said number to attend on her. She answered that for anything that I could do, that she would name none. 'Let the Queen,' said she, 'do with me what she will.' Then I named them myself, both men and women mentioned in this schedule, and have taken order for dispatching away the rest, according to your Highness' commandment, saving some that I have staid in safe keeping until your Majesty's pleasure be further known.

"I have simply ordered that neither she nor her attendants shall pass the gates till your Highness command otherwise. No practice can be attempted without being met with."—Sheffield Castle, 9th Sept., 1571. *Signed. Pp.* 2.

[* This number is not clear, the paper being torn.]

[1] Shrewsbury to Burghley, Sept. 11th.—*MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. VII., No. 42.

opportunity of appealing to popular sympathy, by being "more strictly kept," for it appeared to Shrewsbury that he was a person "very unmeet to be suffered to remain about London, or elsewhere in the realm." Burghley was quite of this opinion, and ordered him to be "directed" to Scotland. For the rest of the dismissed ones, it was provided that such as would go into Scotland should have direction to pass by one of the Wardens of the Marches, and those who would go into France, were to have passports to London. Among those who left, were John Gordon, previously referred to, and Willie Douglas, the hero of the escape from Lochleven, both Protestants. For the conversion of these heretics, the Queen showed herself very solicitous; and before her servants she displayed the most pious resignation. A more edifying epistle was never written, than Mary's letter to those who left her. Read without the light of surrounding facts, the Queen of Scots would be regarded as a suffering saint. Knowing what we do, she can only be looked upon as a perfect actor.

The letter, as translated in Turnbull's "Letters of Mary Stuart," is as follows:—

"From Sheffield, the 18th September, 1571.

"My faithful and good servants, seeing that it has pleased God to visit me with so much affliction, and now with this strict imprisonment, and the banishment of you, my servants, from me, I return thanks to the same God, who has given me strength and patience to endure it, and pray that this good God may give you like grace, and that you may console yourselves, since your banishment is on account of the good service which you have rendered to me, your Queen and mistress; for

that at least will be very great honour to you to have given so good proof of your fidelity in such an exigence; and if it shall be the pleasure of the good God to restore me to liberty, I shall never forget you all, but shall reward you according to my power. At present I have written to my Ambassador for your maintenance, not having it in my power to do better towards you, as I should wish; and now at your departure, I charge each one of you, in the name of God, and for my blessing, that you be good servants to God, and do not murmur against him for any affliction which may befal you, for thus it is his custom to visit his chosen. I commend to you the faith in which you have been baptized and instructed along with me, remembering that out of the Ark of Noah there is no salvation; and like as you make profession of no other sovereign than myself alone, so I pray you to profess with me one God, one Faith, one Catholic Church, as the greater portion of you have already done. And especially you who are recently reclaimed from your errors, strive to instruct yourselves very rigidly, and found yourselves in the faith; and pray to God to give you constancy, for to such God will never deny his grace; and to you, Master John Gordon and William Douglas, I pray God that he may inspire your hearts. I can do no more.

"Secondly, I commend you to live in friendship and holy charity with each other, and to bear with each other's failings; and now, being separated from me, assist yourselves mutually with the means and graces which God hath given to you; and above all, pray to God for me, and give my very affectionate remembrances to the French Ambassador in London, and tell him the state in which I am. And in France, present my humble duties to all my uncles and friends, and particularly to my grandmother, whom let some of you hasten to visit for me. Beseech my uncle to urge strongly the King, the Queen, and Monsieur, to assist my poor subjects in Scotland; and if I die here, to grant the same protection to my son and my friends as to myself, according to the ancient league of France with Scotland. Remember me to Lord Fleming, the Archbishop of Glasgow, and George Douglas, and all my good subjects; and bid them be of good cheer, and not to be concerned for my

adversity, but each of them to do the best that he can, and tell them to demand from all the sovereigns assistance for our party, and not to mind me, for I am content to endure every kind of affliction and suffering, even death itself, for the liberty of my country. If I die, I only regret that I shall not have the means of rewarding the services and the trouble which they have endured in my quarrel; but I hope that if it shall be so, that God will not leave them unrequited, and will cause my son and the other Catholic princes, my friends and allies, to take them under their protection. If Lord Seton can hear from me, send him the copy of this letter.

"Lastly, if I have not been so good a mistress to you as your necessities required, God is my witness, that my good will has never been wanting, but the means; and if I have sharply reprehended you, God is my witness, that I have intended it for your good, and never to cast you off, or from want of affection. I beseech you, comfort yourselves in God; and you, William Douglas, rest assured that the life which you have risked for mine, shall never be destitute as long as I have a friend alive. Do not part company until you reach the French court, and then all of you together wait upon my Ambassador, and tell him all that you have seen or heard of me or mine. Therefore I pray to God with an anguished and afflicted heart, that according to his infinite mercy he may be the protector of my country and my faithful subjects; and that he may forgive those who have done me so much injury, and are so hostile to me, and turn their hearts to a speedy repentance, and that he may give you all grace, and me also, to conform us to his will.

"Written in prison, in Sheffield Castle, the 18th Sept., 1571.

"If you can keep this letter, take it to the Archbishop of Glasgow, as evidence that your service has been approved by me.

"Your good and gracious mistress,

"Marie R."[1]

Matters fell out at this time very ill against the Queen of Scots. The Duke of Norfolk "made

[1] *Turnbull*, p. 222.

a very lamentable submission to her Majesty, with a request for her mercy;" but he had submitted and professed penitence so often, that his promises were now disregarded. Elizabeth "entered into a great indignation against him;" while as to the Queen of Scots, it was found that she had intended "very dangerous attempts" in conjunction with the Duke. "Your Lordship may also let her know," says Burghley, "that her letters and discourses, in articles, being in cipher, to the Duke of Norfolk, are found, and he hath confessed the same, and delivered the alphabet; so as she may not now find it strange that her Majesty useth her in this sort, but rather think it strange that it is no worse. Indeed, we have the Scottish Queen's writing, and the ciphers."[1]

The activity of the Council in London was leading to the discovery of a mass of evidence, and at Sheffield, Shrewsbury's extra vigilance was rewarded by intercepting Mary's correspondence. On the 16th September, he was able to send up to Burghley, a French boy that had been taken at his gate by Thomas Cootes, his gentleman porter. "Six letters in cipher were found upon him, craftily enclosed in a staff, which he confessed having received from George Douglas, at Darleton, in Scotland, on the sea near Dunbar, with charge to deliver them to any of the Queen's servants."[2] Cootes, together with his prisoner and the letters, was sent to Burghley, who received the gentleman porter of Sheffield Castle with great kindness, while the boy

[1] Burghley to Shrewsbury, Sept. 13.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 57.

[2] Shrewsbury to Burghley, Sept. 16.—*MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. VII., No. 43.

and his letters were very carefully sifted. In a letter to Shrewsbury, dated September 18th, the Secretary says: "The Queen's Majesty accepteth in most thankful part this great circumspection of Mr. Cootes, your gentleman porter, and though it be doubtful how these ciphered letters shall be discovered, yet the service in the intercepting of them doth notably content her Majesty, in that she seeth your Lordship so served, and of so faithful men. My Lord of Norfolk's cause falleth out daily more and more to the offence of her Majesty, whereof in respect of the honour and love I bare him, I am right sorry."[1]

The active enquiry into the Duke of Norfolk's affairs, was bringing to light old plots as well as new ones. Burghley wrote on the 19th October:—

"This matter of the Duke of Norfolk groweth daily larger upon examination. I am sorry to see so many touched therewith. My Lord Cobham is in my house as a prisoner, who otherwise would have been in the Tower. I loved him well, and therefore am sorry for his offence. The conveyance of that Queen from you appeareth to have been many ways attempted, whereof the Duke confesseth to have been acquainted with sundry.... The Bishop of Ross is sent for, and shall be committed to the Tower. It is agreed by the learned counsel, both civil and temporal, that the Queen's Majesty may proceed against him, as against a subject, for treason and conspiracy. Of these things I thought good to give your Lordship knowledge as meet it is; and to advise your Lordship to look well now to her charge."[2]

In the course of these investigations, a still older matter was also brought to light, one that had

[1] *Gatty's* Hunter, p. 104. [2] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 60.

occurred at the time of, or soon after the Northern rebellion. Shrewsbury had then in his service one Hersey Lassells, whom he dismissed about Easter, 1570, on some suspicion of his dealings with the Queen of Scots; and now both he and his brother, Bryan Lassells, had fallen into the hands of "My Lords of her Majesty's Council." They were examined, as hundreds of others were examined, under the fear of, or the actual infliction of torture, and confessed to their intercourse with the Queen of Scots, but said that what had taken place was not without knowledge of the Countess of Shrewsbury. Upon this information Burghley wrote a rather peremptory letter to the Countess, praying her to let him understand the truth of her dealings with Hersey Lassells, "as particularly as your Ladyship can remember."[1] The letter came to the Earl, at Sheffield, while the Countess was at Chatsworth. Seeing its importance, Shrewsbury at once sent his own account of the transaction, but forwarded Burghley's letter to his wife, that she might furnish her own exculpation. Shrewsbury says:—

"Having intelligence that he [Lassells] had received some gift of the Queen, I willed my wife to deal with him and others to whom the Queen bears familiar countenance, so as the better to learn her intentions. I found out thus divers of her meanings and dispositions, which otherwise I could not, touching her escape, which I prevented by altering my order. I am sure that my wife is as ignorant as I am of any letters, tokens, or intelligence, between her and the Duke of Norfolk. Nevertheless, on vehement doubt of further inconvenience, I discharged him and others quietly, almost two years ago. My wife's doings,

[1] Burghley to the Countess of Shrewsbury, 13th Oct.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 59.

by my direction, were only for the better service of her Majesty. Sheffield, 20th October, 1571." [1]

The Countess replied from Chatsworth, writing with her own hand, on the 22nd Oct., as follows:—

"Your letters touching Hersey Lassells came to my hands after my husband had answered them. I doubt not you are persuaded of my dutiful service, but lest you should think any lack of good will to answer, I thought it meet to advertise you of my whole doings in the matter.

"As soon as I had intelligence that this Lassells had some familiar talk with the Queen of Scots, and that my Lord thereupon had laid watch to his doings, this Lassells belike suspecting of my knowledge thereof, desired that he might offer unto me some special matter touching that Queen, with great desire that I should in no wise utter it, for, saith he, she hath most earnestly warned me not to tell you of all creatures. I then, hoping to hear of some practice, answered him that he might assure himself not only to be harmless, but to be well rewarded also at the Queen's Majesty's hands, and of my lord, if he would plainly and truly show of her doings or devices, meet to be known. Then he told me with many words that she pretended great good will unto him, and of good liking of him, and that she would make him a lord; but saith he, I will never be false to the Queen's Majesty, nor to my lord, my master. Further than this I could not learn of him. Then I warned him to remember his duty, and to beware of her, and that she sought to abuse him, and that I knew for certain that she did hate him. He said then that he would take heed, and advertise me of all that he could learn. After this he came to me again, and told me of her familiar talk as before, and of no further matter, saving that he said that he told her how he marvelled that she could love the Duke, having so foul a face, and that she answered that she could like him well enough, because he was wise. Then I warned him again more

[1] Shrewsbury adds in a postscript:—"I have written this without my wife's knowledge, and am assured of her truth and dutiful care for her Majesty's service."—*Hol., p.* 2. *Add. Endd.—MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VII., No. 53.

earnestly than I did before, and told him of her hatred towards him. Then he seemed to credit me. Albeit a while after he desired me by his letters to certify him how I knew she hated him, for saith he, if she so do, she is the falsest woman living. Then my lord and I perceiving his mind so fondly occupied on her, and knowing him to be both vain and glorious, and that he was more like to be made an instrument to work harm than to do good, my lord despatched him out of service, as he hath divers others upon suspicion at sundry times. This came to my knowledge about Candlemas, next after the Northern rebellion, and he was put away about Easter following. I never knew of any dealing between the Queen and the Duke of Norfolk, either by Lassells or any one else. If I had, I trust you think I would have discovered it."

"Commendations to your wife, 'and to my young friend your daughter, the Countess, I trust, of Oxford.'"[1]

Examinations and the reports of spies, confessions and discovered letters, had done their work. The plot of Ridolfi with the Duke, the Queen of Scots, the Bishop of Ross, and their allies, was all unravelled, and it scarcely needed the finishing touch imparted by the interception of a letter from Ridolfi to the Queen of Scots, dated Paris, September 30, setting forth in glowing terms the particulars of his journey from Flanders to Rome; his success with the Duke of Alva, and with the Pope; his voyage to Spain, and his interview with King Philip. Without this evidence it was abundantly clear that Norfolk and Mary had compassed an invasion of the realm, to overthrow Elizabeth, and place the Queen of Scots upon the throne. Yet both had given the amplest pledges to Elizabeth that they would abstain from anything offensive to

[1] *Hol. f.* 3. *Add. Endd. MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VII., No. 54.

her. Norfolk had been abjectly submissive; Mary loftily disclaimed any ill intentions against her "good sister," while both had been secretly working to procure her overthrow. And now it was all out. Elizabeth saw the ramifications of their treachery traced as on a map, and knew the danger from which Providence and her ministers had saved her. Whatever she may have previously thought of restoring the Queen of Scots to her kingdom, her only doubt now must have been whether she might not arraign her for treason. To her ideas of divine right and high prerogative, the thought of trying and condemning an anointed Queen was little short of blasphemy. Mary Stuart had been both false and treacherous, but Elizabeth had not yet brought herself to think of her rival in connection with the block. That was reserved for later years, and was the result of Mary's persistence, in spite of every warning, in plotting her "good sister's" death. At present it was against the Duke of Norfolk that the terrors of the law were directed.

On the 22nd October, with all the facts fresh before her, Elizabeth wrote to the Earl of Shrewsbury, saying she was sure the escape of the Queen of Scots would have been "no small grief to him," and now as matters were turning out,

"She had just cause to think that the Queen of Scots would seek some other means of escape, and he must therefore continue, or increase, if he can, his vigilance; and as the greater the number of her servants, the greater the danger," she desires him to consider of the number the Queen of Scots hath, and presently reduce them to the number of ———.

The number is left blank in the draft, and Burgh-

ley interposed the word "presently," which stands before the word "reduce." Shrewsbury was to allow

"As many women as may be needful for her person, her physician, apothecary, grooms of her chamber, and such as are most necessary for service about her person, and forthwith send away the rest, that they tarry not, nor wander about in the country, but give them passports to pass directly either into Scotland or France. No persons must have access to her, but those who are necessary to serve her at table, or in her chamber. None of those remaining must be allowed to go abroad out of the house, or have conference with any strangers coming to the house."

Thus far Elizabeth appears to have dictated her own ideas, but when the draft was submitted to Burghley he introduced several modifications, and added this last and most significant sentence:

"If she shall by speech mislike hereof, he [Shrewsbury] must say that he understands from the Queen that her intentions and practices against her and the realm deserve a stricter dealing than this, and so time will shortly discover to the world."[1]

Shrewsbury received these instructions on October 25th, and carried them out in every particular. He assured Mary that upon her "plain dealing," Elizabeth's favour would be recovered; but his captive doubted the assertion, and seemed "something to despair."[2] She wrote to Queen Elizabeth on the 29th October, from her "close prison of Sheffield," putting forward "the sad and pathetic complaint of an afflicted Queen prisoner;"[3] and repeated the

[1] Elizabeth to Shrewsbury, Oct. 22.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VII., No. 55.
[2] Shrewsbury to Burghley, Oct. 25.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VII., No. 57.
[3] Mary to Elizabeth, October 29.—*Turnbull*, 225.

substance of her griefs in a letter to M. de la Mothe, dated the 7th November. In the course of that somewhat long letter, Mary says:—

"My people are not permitted to go beyond the gate of this Castle, and all Lord Shrewsbury's servants are prohibited from speaking to mine. The displeasure which this Queen has expressed to you by Burghley, is followed in my instance by new severity and menaces. I am confined to my chamber, of which they wish again to wall up the windows, and make a false door by which they may enter when I am asleep; and my people will no longer be permitted to come there, except a few valets, and the rest of my servants will be removed from me. . . . This Queen positively promised me last year to set me at liberty, whether she made a treaty with me or not; since then she has entered into a negotiation concerning another, with the said King, my good brother, and there is no notice taken of the said promise, as far as I see, but I am abandoned in this captivity. . . . I was very ill used before the arrival of M. de Foix, and I am now still worse, and there is no cruelty with which I am not threatened. . . . The Earl of Shrewsbury, as a great favour, said to me the other day, that he was willing I should take an airing on the leads of this house, where I was about an hour; he had already, with much beating about the bush, sought to intimidate me, by insinuating that I was to be delivered into the hands of my rebels, and then he spoke openly to me of associating my son to my crown, and I should not stir from this country; and in conclusion, was of opinion that I should write to that Queen by Bateman, who was then going to the Court, without, however, giving matter or cause for it. I wrote a letter containing only these three points.

"That in order to consider my affairs, and give orders for the payment of my debts, and remuneration of my servants, permission might be granted for some of my people to come from France to me, or some of yours, if you yourself should be unwilling to take the trouble.

"That a Catholic priest should be sent to me, to say mass and administer the sacraments.

"And that I might hear from my child, and write to admonish him of his duty for the future, making no mention whatever of my treatment, of my kingdom, or my troubles.

"Before closing it, I showed it to the said Earl of Shrewsbury, who did not seem pleased that I mentioned you, but not the said proposal, and my letter therefore was retained. That was the reason that I did not write to you, and left it to them to do, to see if they would say anything of it to you. He boasts of musqueteers being sent to Scotland speedily; I pray you have an eye on that. I have no means of making my mind known to the Earls of Marr and Morton, and to tell you plainly, I am altogether resolved to die Queen of Scotland; if they will let me have the above, I shall do all that I can for their security, and will not hold to that that they come not back from France, or she shall do without me. I am a miserable captive, and supplicate the King, my good brother, to have my kingdom in his protection, conform to the ancient alliance, and to put his hand to it without minding such conventions as are proposed by my enemies, to whom I am resolved to yield nothing relating to my kingdom, but sooner to lose all. This would be to approve (if not entirely, at least in part), what they have proposed, that I was disqualified to return, and give them a pretence for always opposing my release. I shall make them a present of the government of my kingdom, at the cost of a perpetual imprisonment, in reward for the treasons which they have been guilty of against me. But I shall await what it shall please God to send me, and supplicate the said King, my good brother, not to lend an ear to such proposals, and not to be at the trouble of referring in it; for it is a condition which I can have at all times, and which I have long since been sued for, even before the death of the regent. I am much troubled by the intentions of this Queen towards the Duke of Norfolk, and pray to God that he may convert her.

"I have given a memorandum to my tailor to send me some things of which I have need; I pray you, under this pretext, endeavour to send to me or at least something by the carriers, and do not forget the riband. I am very anxious to have some cinnamon water.

"From Sheffield, this 7th day of November."

"*P.S.*—Not being able to write to the Queen, my good mother, I am obliged to trouble you with what I should only have addressed to her; it is to request her to insist upon this Queen that my linen, and that of my women, before being washed, shall not be inspected and overhauled by the porters of this wretched prison, who say they have orders from the said Queen to do so. That Lord Shrewsbury or his lady may appoint me such laundress as they please, in whom they can confide, and that the men do not put their hands thereto."

Endorsed in the autograph of Lord Burleigh, "7th November, 1571. The Scottes Quenes letters to ye Fr. Ambassr. intercepted at Sheffield."[1]

The French Ambassador remonstrated, but in the face of what was known he remonstrated in vain. It was falsely asserted that the Earl of Shrewsbury, "through some effeminate desire, is wholly addicted to the Scottish Queen,"[2] but facts were against these rumours. Shrewsbury proved himself to be fully alert, and said, "they shall buy her dearly that shall get her forth of my hands." The news of Sir Henry Percy's projected attempt [see page 180] roused the old nobleman's combativeness.

"I had as lieve deal with him as another," he says, "for that in resisting him, being a soldier, I should win more credit, and, seeing his coming on the Queen's commandment to be doubted, I have taken such order with my son Francis Talbot, and Hew Nyvell, who I know is trusty and wise, and that if they pursue any attempt given to me, they shall be able with Halifax vicarage, and the honor of Pomfrett, and my neighbours in Hallamshire, if they were 5000 men, to give them such a banquet as they should repent if they would come to Sheffield, and put the prince to no charges at all for any such sudden attempt."[3]

[1] *Turnbull*, p. 227.

[2] John Lee to Burghley, Antwerp, 9th Nov.—*MSS. Dom. Eliz., Addenda*, v. 20, No. 91.

[3] Shrewsbury to Burghley, Oct. 24.—*MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. VII., No. 56.

The watching of every ingress, the jealous guarding of the neighbourhood, and the strictness of the search of all strangers, were rewarded by frequent discoveries. The channels of Mary's communications became known, and letters fell into the hands of the authorities. Bastian, her favourite page, was found delivering to a messenger ciphered letters from the Queen to the French Ambassador, and Shrewsbury enquired of Burghley what he was to do both with Bastian and his messengers. The man appointed to carry the ciphers confessed that he had brought letters from the French Ambassador "last week." They were given to him "in Paul's Church," by one Nykeles, an English interpreter. The same man had previously carried letters from Mary to the Ambassador, "and delivered them with his own hand at his house." Shrewsbury had long suspected one Adryan Home of being a chief conveyer of letters, but could never try him till he was gone. Now he heard that he intended to send letters next week "very cunningly," and as he hoped to meet with them, he begged Burghley to "forbear him a few days." On Thursday, he met with a "blank," of Adryan's going to London. "The meaning was to try a messenger."[1]

These sentences give us some little insight into the state of affairs. Mary and her friends were ever trying new devices to communicate, and acting with extreme caution in the selection of the bearers of letters, trying their messengers with blank sheets of paper folded and directed, to see whether or not they

[1] Shrewsbury to Burghley, Nov. 19.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VII., No. 65.

were trustworthy. Against the ingenuity thus displayed was set the watchfulness of Shrewsbury at Sheffield, and of Burghley in London; and though doubtless much escaped them, a great deal fell into their hands. Mary pleaded with the French Ambassador for cinnamon water and nutmegs, and told him how the want of air and exercise was advancing the decline of her health.[1] The letter never reached its destination, but was placed by Burghley among his papers.

Among other schemes that must have floated before the busy brain of the minister as he considered the best way of dealing with the troublesome lady at Sheffield, appears to have been one for taking her out of the hands of Shrewsbury, and placing her under the care of persons of meaner estate. Whether the thought arose from doubt of Shrewsbury's vigilance, or from a determination to treat the Queen of Scots with less consideration does not appear. John Bateman, the Earl's secretary, who was in London in the middle of November, appears to have been the bearer of letters broaching this idea to Shrewsbury, and he thus reports the delivery of his message:

"Have delivered your letters to my lord, and declared to him that the Queen will be removed to some other place, and looked after by persons of meaner estate. His lordship took this thankfully to his contentation, and said that as he had always served with care and study, like a true subject, so he will be ready anyway to do her Majesty's pleasure. He seems troubled for two reasons. First, he doubts some evil reports have been made of him, to bring him in suspicion; if so, he

[1] Mary to La Mothe, Nov. 18.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VII., No. 64.

desires most earnestly to answer them. Secondly, committing the Queen to the care of some other subject, he fears that some lack of ability or care will be thought to be in him by the world. He hopes the Queen will consider his credit. He always welcomes your letters, and makes special account of your goodwill and assistance in anything touching his honour. Though the Queen is kept much closer than before, and her men not suffered to pass the gates, nor confer with any other, yet the Earl, for better surety and satisfaction of her Majesty, has increased his soldiers and furniture, and made stricter orders for her sure keeping and avoiding of practices.—Sheffield, 23rd Nov., 1571." [1]

Besides his letters for the Earl of Shrewsbury, Bateman, who arrived in Sheffield on the 20th or 21st November, brought letters from the Bishop of Ross for the Queen of Scots, and also a copy of the then newly published "Detection," written by Mary's old enemy, George Buchanan, in answer to the Bishop of Ross's "Defence." The "Detection" deals chiefly with Mary's infatuation for Bothwell, and her concern in the murder of Darnley. It relates, in coarse terms, her conduct towards the King, and her shameless partiality for Bothwell; but it never so much as glances at the shortcomings of the foolish and wicked Darnley, or the murder of David Rizzio. The "Detection" is not history, but the pleading of a partisan, and as such must its statements be received.

The reception of this book threw Mary into a state of high indignation, and she marked her sense of the outrage by writing angrily to M. de la Mothe Fénélon. Her letter is dated the 22nd Nov., and remarks that the book does not say where it was printed, or by

[1] Bateman to Burghley, Nov. 23.—*Hol. MSS. Mary Q. of S.* v. VII., No. 68.

whom, but it was brought hither by Mr. Bateman, "a person so wary, that I am sure he would not have it in his possession unless it were permitted to carry one in this kingdom; and, moreover, he would not have dared or allowed it to be shown to me if he had not had express orders to do so."[1] Bateman, writing on the 12th Dec. to Lord Burghley, says:—

"'As to the Latin book which I brought, the Scotch Queen seems to think I brought it by your Lordship's order.' He assured her that he did it only of his own proper will; and when she said it was a shame to suffer it abroad, he pointed out that 'there appeared no authority either from the Queen or any of the Council for the printing thereof, no mention being made of privilege or allowance; but it was written and set out by some of her own countrymen, and spread abroad in many men's hands, and I thought it well to bring one to show to my Lord.' To these excuses Mary answered that she knew G. Buchanan was the author, 'a vile atheist, at whom she is not a little offended for the same, and for that he is schoolmaster to her son.' 'She has not seen the book in English or Scotch, as far as I know,' adds Bateman, for 'though there are some in the house, my Lord ordered that none of them should come to her hands or her peoples.'"[2]

A letter of the Earl of Shrewsbury's, written at this time, gives us an interesting glimpse of his intercourse with the captive Queen:—

"Have received your courteous letters by Bateman; and delivered to the Queen of Scots the enclosed letters from the Bishop of Ross, reading which did not seem to please her. She said that she thought it was Esau's hand, but it was Jacob's voice, and that the Bishop did use his hand, but it was some other that guided the pen. Though the Bishop, said she, did as they would have him do, yet shall they find me to be a Queen and to

[1] Mary to La Mothe.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VII., No. 66.

[2] Bateman to Burghley.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VII., No. 74.

have the heart of a Queen, with many other like words after her wonted miscontented manner, not speaking specially to any point, but generally shifting off as though the evils discovered were nothing of hers. She showed me at last the Bishop's letters, but only for once reading thereof. They contain most shameful heinous matter, and therefore I see that it becometh every true subject of the Queen's Majesty, setting all other respects or business aside, to stand and continue stout and faithful to his charge and calling—God preserve her Majesty, and quickly confound and root out all her enemies.—Sheffield, 23, Nov., 1571."[1]

To the Bishop, Mary wrote herself, using the same simile about Esau and Jacob, and telling him that she had now been confined for ten weeks in her chamber, which, considering her disorder, endangered her life; and however her death might gratify her enemies, she called God to witness that she considered herself in no danger from the Earl of Shrewsbury, who would have a due regard to his honour. She was determined to do her duty in preserving her life; but if it pleased God to take it, it would not be much to her grief. Yet would she die with the constancy of a good Christian, and of a Queen descended of such blood as hers. She should rejoice to leave this false world with a fair conscience, knowing she had left a son and heir, who had friends, that were able to defend her cause and his, after she was gone.[2]

In some such strain as this Mary complained to Lord Shrewsbury; but, when writing to her friends abroad, the injured innocent became the stirrer up

[1] Shrewsbury to Burghley, Nov. 23, condensed, Signed.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VII., No. 69.

[2] Mary to Ross, Nov. 22.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VII., No. 67.

of rebellion, and the contriver of foreign invasion. She told Lethington and Grange, that her friends beyond the sea still held good, and were waiting for a convenient time to put to their hands.[1] To Lord Seaton she wrote, asking him to ascertain the Duke of Alva's intentions in answer to her various ciphers.[2] Would he invade or would he not invade? Was he ready to throw an army on the coasts of England, and join in the overthrow of Elizabeth, or did he hang back? These were important questions for Mary, but they were equally important to Elizabeth, and we cannot wonder that she and her Ministers objected to such overtures.

"When she complained of restraint," says Bateman, in the same letter to Burghley, from which we have already quoted, "my Lord told her roundly, in my hearing, that she was the only cause thereof herself, by her unlawful practices against the Queen and the realm, which now are manifested to the world. He told her also that the world judges her to be the only cause of the destruction of the Duke of Norfolk and his house, with divers others. At this she seemed very little moved or sorry. Her physician says she will fall again into some extremity of sickness, and would write to the French Ambassador to procure more liberty for her; but the Earl is well acquainted with their devices, and will give no ear to such motions, and will not trouble the Queen's Majesty with writing or sending unless there is something of great moment."[3]

The Earl of Shrewsbury himself wrote to Burghley, on the 12th December, as follows:—

"After I had despatched this bearer, the Queen made great

[1] Mary to Lethington and Grange, Dec. 10.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VII., No. 71. It is noteworthy that all Mary's letters, about this time, fell into the hands of the authorities, and are found among the Public Records. This shows how strict was the watch upon all her doings.

[2] Mary to Seaton, Dec. 10.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VII., No. 73.

[3] Bateman to Burghley, Dec. 12.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VII., No. 74.

complaint to me of her sickly estate, and that she looked verily to perish thereby, and used divers melancholy words, that it is meant it should so come to pass, without help of medicine, and all because I was not ready to send up her physician's letters unto you, which, indeed, I refused, seeing that her principal drift was to have some liberty out of these gates, which I will in no wise consent to, as I see no small peril therein.

"However, lest she might think her Majesty had commanded me to deny her such reasonable means as might save her life by order of physic, I thought it not amiss to send up the enclosed letters; but I should be very loath for any liberty to be granted to her or hers out of the gates. I allow her to walk upon the leads in the open air, in my large dining room, or in the court-yard, with myself or my wife in her company, avoiding all other's talk, either to herself or to any of hers. Safe watch is kept within and without the walls, night and day.—Sheffield Castle, 12 Dec., 1571.

"I cannot perceive that she is in any present peril, but if any ensue, I will send word. I am utterly against any further liberty to her."[1]

[1] *Cotton MSS. Caligula*, *c.* III., 208. Along with the above letter was enclosed the following:—

Castellanus, Queen Mary's physician, to Burghley—

"About 26 Oct., 'Provenchere' wrote me letters, which you sent to the Earl of Shrewsbury, desiring me to speak privately to the Queen. As the matter is of great importance, I thought it well to write to you about her health. I asked 'Provenchere' to speak to De la Mothe, the French Ambassador, before he returned to France, and afterwards with her relations and friends in France.

"I said that I wished her to be seen by other physicians. Her disease originates from melancholy, bilious and adust humours, and increases daily, both on account of the cessation of her usual exercise, and her mental troubles. I was then almost destitute of medicines, and now things are worse, on account of a swelling of the left hypochondria; frequent distillations from the brain; extreme debility of the stomach, which disturbs sleep; frequent vomiting, and many other symptoms. Unless they are speedily remedied, nothing can be expected but an unfortunate ending.

"Begs him to persuade her Majesty to allow the Queen more fresh air and exercise, and other proper remedies. While she is confined to the house, and suffers such grief, the remedies which we have hitherto used can be of no service. I am not allowed to go out to buy medicines, and have no one whom I can trust. Nothing is left me but the name of a doctor.

"I wish De la Mothe to know this, that I may not be blamed hereafter for failing in my duty. Wrote to him lately to send cinnamon water, preserved musk nuts (*nuces muscatas conditas*), and other medicines, but as I have had no reply, I fear my letters have not reached him.

"Begs him to show the above to her Majesty."—Sheffield Castle, 3 id., Dec., 1571.—*Hol. Latin*, *pp.* 2. *Add. Endd. Caligula*, *c.* III., 213.

Thus the eventful year drew towards a close. Mary, conspiring and yet complaining when she suffered some of the consequences of conspiracy, lay closely guarded at Sheffield. Norfolk, with a charge of high treason hanging over his head, was in the Tower. The Bishop of Ross, alone of all the leading actors, appears to have found time for frivolous cares. His cook wished for leave to go to France, but the Bishop set great store by this functionary, and would by no means grant his request. Was not Christmas coming, and what could a Christian do at such a season without a cook? He must not think of leaving, but rather provide a store of wild fowl, such as partridges, pheasants, turkey-cocks, and other delicacies, that the Bishop might feast and be merry, even in this his season of adversity. Here was true philosophy, the philosophy that never cries over spilled milk, but makes the best of every circumstance.[1]

[1] Ross to Cuthbert Reid, Dec. 20.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VII., No. 77.

CHAPTER IX.

AT the opening of the year 1572, the government of Elizabeth was surrounded with difficulties. Any choice that might be made seemed a choice of evils. The nobility, mindful of the dire experiences of the Wars of the Roses, were anxious for a settlement of the succession, and ready to take almost any step to force Elizabeth to a decision. The Catholics were discontented, and ripe for mischief, with the Queen of Scots as their heroine, and Philip of Spain as their ally. The disclosures of the Ridolfi conspiracy showed Elizabeth the nature and extent of her danger. To overlook the intrigue, and pardon the chief offenders, would have indicated weakness rather than clemency, and encouraged treason. To place the Duke of Norfolk and Mary Stuart on their trial, would have been a defiance of the Catholic Powers of Europe, and of her own Catholic subjects. The Duke of Norfolk stood at the head of the English nobility, and was almost a sovereign in his own province. He fancied himself too powerful to be held to close account, and presumed on the Queen's reluctance to gage the law against his feudal power. As to Mary Stuart, her guilt was as clear as Norfolk's, but Elizabeth had not yet reconciled herself to the idea of trying a

queen. Balancing probabilities, and weighing the comparative advantages of boldness and leniency, the Queen gradually brought herself to the conclusion that the time had come when she must venture something for the honour and safety of her crown. Norfolk must be placed on his trial. On this point, at least, Elizabeth had resolved, before the end of December, 1571, and Shrewsbury, whom she had chosen to preside at the trial, was summoned in January to attend the Court.

The new year thus brought changes at Sheffield. The Earl of Shrewsbury, who had been now, for nearly three years, almost as close a prisoner as the Queen of Scots, was allowed to exchange one care for another—to cease to be a jailer, that he might become a judge. Attended by an imposing retinue, he placed his foot in the stirrup within the court-yard of the Castle at Sheffield, and rode through his park towards the south. For many miles his way lay through his own lands, and not till he had well passed Wingfield did he find himself out of hail of his tenants. Arrived in London, Elizabeth accorded to her faithful and much-tried subject, a most friendly welcome, professing the utmost satisfaction with the fidelity and circumspection of his service.

On Wednesday, the 16th of January, at eight o'clock in the morning, Westminister Hall exhibited the customary arrangements for the trial of a Peer. "First of all there was prepared a large scaffold, about a foot distant from the Chancery Court; and to the same scaffold a long passage about six feet broad, and high built all the way as far as the

Common Pleas Bar. In the middle, on the south side of the scaffold, was erected a chair somewhat higher than the rest, with a cloth of state, for the Lord High Steward of England, who, for that day, was George, Earl of Shrewsbury." To right and left of the Steward's chair were ranged seats for the Peers, in order of rank, and on a lower form sat the Judges of England.

"The Lord High Steward being set in his chair, and all the Lords set in their places, with a great number of people in the hall; about half-an-hour past eight in the morning, the Lord High Steward stood up at his chair bare headed; and Mr. Norris, the gentleman usher, holding the white rod before him, Littleton, the Serjeant-at-Arms," made proclamation of silence. The Commission was read, the Lords answered to their names, and in obedience to the customary summons, Sir Owen Hopton, Lieutenant of the Tower, led in his prisoner, Thomas, Duke of Norfolk. Behind him came the Tower Chamberlain, bearing the axe with its edge away from the Duke, who "with a haughty look and oft biting his lip," surveyed the Lords on each side of him. Thus the trial began. The indictment was carefully prepared. It charged the Duke with compassing and imagining the death of the Queen, and her deprivation, with seeking the alteration of the state and of religion, striving to raise rebellion and induce foreign enemies to invade the kingdom; with corresponding with "Mary, late Queen of Scotland," contrary to his promise; with sending money to the rebel Earls of Northumberland and West-

Thomas Howard, Fourth Duke of Norfolk.

Beheaded 2nd June, 1572.

moreland; and with consulting with Ridolfi to obtain money from the Pope and the Duke of Alva, and persuade them to send an army to deliver the Scottish Queen.

"The sitting," says a contemporary narrative, —probably the very one that Lord Burghley sent down to Sheffield to be communicated to the Queen of Scots,—"The sitting continued until it was past eight in the night, from eight in the morning, which hath not been seen in any time, and the cause was for that the matters were so many, and he permitted with all favour to speak as much and when he would."

When everything had been said, every plea urged, the Peers retired to consult on their verdict, leaving the Lord High Steward seated in his chair. After a deliberation lasting an hour-and-a-quarter, the Lords again entered the hall and sat down. Then each one was challenged, from the lowest to the highest, and each pronounced the solemn word, "Guilty."

"The edge of the axe was forthwith turned towards Norfolk, and Shrewsbury in the usual form pronounced sentence, adding, 'the Lord have mercy upon thee.' The Duke having heard his fate said, 'This is the judgment of a traitor, and I shall die as true a man to the Queen as any liveth; seeing that you my Lords, my Peers, have judged me unworthy of your company, I will none of you, but trust to go to another and a better assembly.' This he spake with some passion. Otherwise truly he did use himself all the day long very modestly and wisely, as far forth as his cause could serve him."

"Then the Lieutenant of the Tower was commanded to avoid his prisoner, which thing was done." "And therewith the Lord Steward standing up afore his chair broke his rod in the midst, and the people cried, God save the Queen."[1]

As Shrewsbury left Sheffield, Sir Ralph Sadler, who had been appointed to take charge of the Queen of Scots in his absence, approached it. The 1st of January, or the day following, witnessed his arrival in Yorkshire, with a goodly train of attendants, and 36 horses.[2] The neighbourhood cannot have impressed him with its cheerfulness in the midst of winter. Beautiful as is the scenery, and rich as were the park and the chases of Hallamshire with timber and game, Sadler's thoughts were concentrated on his unpleasant task, and his chief desire was to get back, as soon as possible, to the more genial atmosphere of London and the Court. He found everything in Sheffield in good order, Lord and Lady Shrewsbury being "very careful of their charge," and the Earl's servants so well ordered and well disposed to their duties, that he saw no cause to doubt that "this charge would be well discharged." The Queen of Scots was taciturn, and at first indisposed to talk much with her new guardian. For six days after his arrival she never came out of her bedchamber, and, during the first fortnight, he only saw her twice, walking on the leads over her lodging, or in the court within the gate, "for her health's sake,

[1] The trial of Thomas Howard, Duke of Norfolk, before the Lords, at Westminster, for high treason, January 16th, 1571-2, 14 Eliz. *State Trials*, v. i, p. 81, *et seq.*; also, *Sadler Papers*, v. 3, p. 98 to 101.

[2] Sadler to Burghley, Jan. 21.—*Strickland*, v. 1, p. 246.

as she says;" and occasionally she appeared in my lord's dining chamber adjoining her lodging.[1] But if the Queen was quiet, the Countess of Shrewsbury was communicative. Pouring into the ear of the knight the stories of her own fidelity and watchfulness, the Countess fully convinced him that she was "a good servant," and deserved "great thanks," "condign thanks."

If all Mary's guardians had been like Sadler, as observant, and as apt at committing their observations to paper, we should possess a far more life-like account of her captivity than the more bald letters of Shrewsbury convey. To Shrewsbury everything was familiar, and partook very much of routine; but when Sadler came down he saw all the Queen's doings with the freshness of a stranger, and noted what he saw for the information of Burghley. His modesty prompted him to preface his letters with the assurance that there was nothing special to communicate, and he affected to write only to keep the posts employed, for, he says, "whether they work or play, they have their hire, and, therefore, I spare not their labour." But in fact he sent most graphic sketches of Mary's prison life, the possession of a few of which only makes us regret that there are not more of them.

It may be convenient to notice here a document that belongs to a much later period of the captivity of the Queen of Scots—the month of August, 1584, when Sir Ralph Sadler again came down to Sheffield, with Mr. Somer, to remove Queen Mary to Wing-

[1] Sadler to Burghley, Jan. 14.—*Cott. MSS. Caligula*, c. III, folio 206.

field. We refer to it here, rather than in its proper chronological order, because it throws considerable light on the kind of precautions taken for the safety of the Queen of Scots, and because the arrangements of the Earl of Shrewsbury were not materially different in 1572, from what they were when he finally found relief from his charge in 1584.

There were forty soldiers ordinarily in the house, "most of them being the sons" of the Earl's tenants, "of good account and otherwise well known to his Lordship to be faithful to the Queen's Majesty our Sovereign and trusty to him." They were under the command of Mr. Bentall, the gentleman porter, "a gentleman of good wisdom and good trust by long experience;" and were armed with "calyvers, pertaysans, and halberds," "and such other furniture" as might be appointed them. They also wore swords and daggers, and were ordered not to lay them aside until they went to bed; and even there their weapons were to be ever at the bed side, that each might "be ready of offend and defend when occasion shall require." Among the soldiers, of whom Sadler gives a list, may be recognised the names of many old Hallamshire yeoman families. There were Henry Waterhouse, of Onesacre; two Brownells, two Parkers, two Hawkesworths, Edward Hudson, Rowland Longston, Tho. Darwin, Geo. Ronksley, Thos. Chapman, Wm. Moreton, Wm. Sparrow, Henry Rogers, Thos. Bright, Edw. Creswick, Hy. Wilcoxon, Thos. Machin, John Beighton, Roger Smylter, and some others, whose descendants are still to be found in various stations of life in

and around Sheffield. It was the business of the "gentlemen yeoman and soldiers" to keep watch and ward, both within the Castle and when the Queen went abroad. Two yeomen "by course (always two) do watch and ward at the stair foot of the said Scots Queen's lodging, from which there is but one way." Eight soldiers were always on duty, four within the house and four without, besides the two yeomen at the stair foot. A drum sounded from Lady-day to Michaelmas, at five in the morning and eight at night; and from Michaelmas to Lady-day, at six o'clock morning and evening. The watches being set, every man was strictly enjoyned to keep his appointed place, and suffer none to pass without the watchword or in company with the officer in charge. The watch was relieved "at ten and at two in the morning," and every night "by nine of the clock at the farthest." The gentleman porter furnished the names of the watch and the watchword to the Earl, or such as might be in charge under him. In case of alarm, "by watch, ward, drum, trumpet, or otherwise," all in the house were to come forth with all possible speed and obey the directions of the Earl, or the officer in charge; but none of the Queen's people were to come out of their chambers "upon peril of their lives," until called by name or specially licensed by the Earl or his officer. At eleven o'clock every forenoon the Castle gates were shut, and so kept until all the house had dined, and, during that sacred prandial hour, none were allowed to pass to and fro, except the Earl's servants on his special business. When

the Queen "goith abrode" every gentleman yeoman and soldier was bound to be ready upon warning given, with furniture and weapons to wait upon her, and none were to "wander or straggle abroad out of her sight until she be returned into her chamber." The Queen's servants were not allowed to pass out of the gates without leave; and, when they got leave, soldiers were to guard them and see that they held no conference with strangers, nor delivered or received letters, nor passed beyond the bounds prescribed in their permit. None of the Earl's servants were allowed to "use any conference" with the Queen or any of her people, "other than officers for their necessary occasions."

To these conditions and regulations Sadler thought it prudent to add others. He required all the forty soldiers, the two laundresses who "do use to wash and dry within the house and go very seldom forth," and the coachman, to "gyve their corporall othes" to serve truly and faithfully and obey orders. He advised that the justices of the peace of the adjoining country should be charged, and the constables sworn, "to be careful in their several divisions and limits to observe all passengers unknown," and to report any such at the Castle. The night watchers too were to be increased in all places "by two persons more than usual," and two were to be appointed to ward upon the highways of every parish within a radius of six miles. Any "suspected wandering person" was to be taken to the nearest justice and "examined and searched for letters and other carriages," and if anything suspicious

was found the person was to be taken before Sir Ralph. The same care was to be exercised towards "other travellers unknown" lodging or resting in any town or village within the limits of the Earl's officers' jurisdiction.[1]

Sadler, on his arrival at this Castle of Care, promptly sought an interview with the Queen, and told her that his mistress, having occasion to employ Shrewsbury in her affairs, had commanded him to supply his absence. He offered to do anything acceptable to her, so far as he might, without offence to his duty. The Queen answered with her accustomed haughtiness. She was in the Queen, her sister's hands, and might be ordered as pleased her; but she thought herself somewhat hardly dealt withal, beyond her deserts.

"I doubt not," said Sadler, "but your Grace's own conscience can tell you that the Queen has great reason and good cause to do more than she does, as I both can and will make plain to your Grace when it pleases you to confer more thereof with me."

"I know of no such cause," answered Mary, "but will arm myself with patience to suffer whatever may happen. My causes are in God's hands, and he can restore me when it shall please him." "I gave her no further occasion to talk at this first time of access to her," says Sadler, in reporting his interview.[2] He delivered his message, accepted her answer, and then withdrew. When he sought her presence again,

[1] *Sadler Papers*, v. 3, pp. 122 to 126.

[2] Sadler to Burghley, Jan. 3.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VIII., No. 1.

the subject was renewed. Mary opened the conversation by complaining of her Majesty's straight dealing with her. Sadler replied that she was the cause of it herself, for the Queen had great reason to do as she had done, and much more also. "No prince having such matter against her as the Queen has, would use her so graciously and courteously." He told her plainly, "with such reverence as appertaineth," what attempts and practices she and her adherents and ministers have practised for her escape, and otherwise, to the peril and disturbance of the state of the realm, "whereof she maketh herself altogether innocent for her own part; what the Duke of Norfolk and others have done, she saith, she cannot tell."

"Let them answer for themselves, saith she, and she will answer for herself in such sort, if she may be indifferently heard, as it shall well appear that she hath done nothing but that she might do for her own help, without hurt or peril to the Queen her sister, or trouble of the realm; for she saith she wrote to the Queen her sister, that if she could have no better relief at her hands, she must and would seek other friends, and so hath she done, but not by such means as might breed any peril to the Queen her sister, or any disturbance of her realm. As for the Bishop of Ross, he is, she saith, a flayed priest, a fearful priest, who will say whatsoever you will have him to say; and if he were at liberty out of this realm, she is sure he would unsay that he hath said. Ridolfi, she saith, is a man to her unknown. She never saw him; ne hath had to do with him. And so she flyeth from all things which may touch her, and will needs be innocent of all manner of practices tending either to the late rebellion, or otherwise to the peril of the Queen's Majesty, or any other disturbance of this State. Which how true it is you know, and she perceiveth that I believe her not."[1]

[1] Sadler to Burghley, Jan. 9.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VIII, No. 4.

At the time of these conversations, Mary was confining herself to her chamber, where she was continually visited by the Countess of Shrewsbury; but on the morning of Thursday, the 10th of January, "the weather being fair, the Queen, for her health's sake, which," remarks Sadler, "is really not good, walked in the court with Lady Shrewsbury, within the Castle gates." As the ladies paced backwards and forwards within the walled enclosure, on the level ground, where now stand steel furnaces, and a mart for horses, the high ground of the Park lay within view, and, crowning the eastern height, appeared the twin towers of the Lodge. The Countess was probably thinking less of natural beauty than of the safety of her charge. The maids of honour and the pages moved respectfully behind the Queen, and chatted on such scraps of news as reached them from the outer world. Cuthbert Rede had come in the day before from the Bishop of Ross, and, spite of all the care of Sadler and the Countess, a few crumbs of intelligence had reached the ears of the Queen of Scots' attendants. They were talking over the occurrence, prepared to improve every opportunity, when suddenly their tongues were stilled. Even the Queen paused as she saw the small figure of the courtly Sadler approach with becoming reverence to solicit her commands. The old grievance of the detention of her correspondence was in her mind, quickened by a fresh instance of delay. It so happened, that the day before this walk in the court-yard, Cuthbert Rede had been the bearer of drugs, and some other matters, from the

French Ambassador, and also of a letter. Now letters at Sheffield were contraband, and the gentleman porter at the Castle, "an honest, faithful, and trusty man," whom Burghley had already had occasion to commend, finding one in the possession of Rede, seized it, and gave it to Sadler. The other portion of his burden was duly delivered by Mary's instructions to her physician and secretary, and consisted of "two little stone bottles full of salve and ointments, a tin bottle of cinnamon water, and a few lemons and oranges." Rede also mentioned the letter, and the intelligence of its existence was conveyed to Queen Mary's ears. At ten o'clock the same night she sent to Sadler to ask for its delivery, and was told that she should have it in the morning. Meanwhile Sir Ralph opened and carefully read the communication, but "found no great matter in it." Seeing a blank space where there might possibly have been invisible writing, he tried it with fire and with water, but could find nothing, and concluded that the prize was of little value. Meeting her guardian, as we have seen, in the court-yard on Thursday morning, the Queen at once asked for her letter.

"There have been so many practices wrought by you and your ministers, Madam," answered Sadler gravely, "that I am afraid of letters. My commission is to see the drugs and other matters delivered, and that I have done, but I have no orders for the delivery of letters."

"I have nothing to do with the practices other people may have wrought by letters," answered

Mary, "I have done nothing but what might be done with honour; but if I may not have the letter, at least let M. de la Mothe Fénélon know that it has not been delivered to me."

There really was nothing of any moment in the letter, and Sadler, pausing a moment, and reflecting that an appearance of concession might not be altogether thrown away, handed the document to the Queen, at the same time asking her to return it.

"It has been opened," said the royal lady, with some indignation. Sadler bowed assent.

"May I write a reply?" asked Mary, adding, "I will write nothing that all the world may not see."

"Your Grace may do so, an it please you," said Sadler, "and I will see your letter conveyed."

With these words the conference closed. The Queen of Scots withdrew to her apartments, and Sadler passed into the hall. The same night Mary returned the letter of the ambassador, together with her reply, and both were sent to London by the hand of Cuthbert Rede. As they lay on the writing table in Sadler's room, awaiting despatch, one of his "young men," taking up the ambassador's letter as a scrap of waste paper, tried his pen on it, "blotting and raising" the back, and his master felt it needful to apologize to Lord Burghley for the mischance, so minutely was every occurrence noted. Along with the letter, Mary sent a verbal message to the French Ambassador. Secretary Rollett, after obtaining Sadler's leave, "told Cuthbert that the Queen desired him to give her commendations to M. de la Mothe, and tell him that she had

written to him, and given the letter to" Sadler. "She would have sent him a copy of her letter to Queen Elizabeth, but thought" that he might obtain one from Burghley. "She desired him to obtain leave for her from the Queen to write to France for money, having none to buy herself clothes or other necessaries, or to pay her servants' wages."[1]

These were Mary's ordinary troubles. She might have uttered such complaints any day of the whole eighteen years of her captivity. But a trouble was now approaching more serious than the detention of letters, or the want of money; nothing less than the overturning of all her contrivances for regaining liberty. On the Norfolk marriage hung Mary's hopes. Towards that all her plots had tended. It formed the centre around which her actions were grouped; and rudely as her calculations had been disturbed by the discoveries of the preceding autumn, she had not quite abandoned hope. Sharing Norfolk's confidence in his own power and importance, she had never brought herself to believe that Elizabeth would arraign, convict, and bring him to the scaffold. While he lived, even in prison, she hoped on, and looked for a change of fortune and better times. She had as perfect confidence in Norfolk's power of dissimulation as in her own, and experience had given her some reason to trust to the vacillation of Elizabeth. Unlimited professions of attachment and good-will might even yet, she thought, open the prison doors, and leave the

[1] Sadler to Burghley.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VIII., No. 5.

conspirators free to renew their practices. Thus may Mary have reasoned, and reasoned faultily; but January saw her hopes dashed to the ground. Shrewsbury was absent, she knew, on important affairs, and the voluble tongue of his Countess disclosed his errand. The result of Norfolk's trial became known in Sheffield on the 20th of January. It was a Sunday morning, when letters from Lord Burghley, dated January 17th, arrived at the Castle, with intelligence that afforded no little comfort to Sadler, for he had long been of opinion that Elizabeth and her faithful councillors would do well "to study to cut off the occasion and root of these devilish and wicked practices," by the execution of both Norfolk and Mary Stuart.

"All the last week," says Sadler, in a letter written on the following day (Jan. 21st), "this Queen did not once look out of her chamber, hearing that the Duke of Norfolk stood upon his arraignment and trial; and being troubled, in all likelihood, with a guilty conscience, and fear to hear such news as she hath now received." Sadler appears to have had no reluctance to communicate the unwelcome intelligence to the Queen. No sooner had he read his letters than he "forthwith imparted" their contents to Lady Shrewsbury, "to the end that she might take occasion to make this Queen understand of the same." But the ill news, ever true to its character, flew even faster than the zealous Sadler had anticipated. Mary heard of her misfortune, before the Countess could enjoy the malicious pleasure of telling it.

Full of the importance of her communication, Elizabeth Shrewsbury entered the Queen's apartment, to find her "all bewept and mourning." Enquiring with her usual sharpness, "what ailed her," the captive answered:—

"That she was sure my lady could not be ignorant of the cause, and that she could not but be much grieved to understand of the trouble of her friends, which she knew well did fare the worse for her sake, for sure she was the Duke fared the worse for that which she had of late written to the Queen's Majesty; and [she] said further that he was unjustly condemned, protesting that as far as ever she could perceive by him, or for anything she knew, he was a true man to the Queen, her sister."

With strict common sense, and some little impatience at the boldness of these assertions, the Countess replied:—

"She might be sure that whatsoever she had written to the Queen's Majesty could do the Duke neither good nor harm, touching his condemnation; so if his offences and treason had not been great, and plainly proved against him, those noblemen who passed on his trial, would not for all the good on earth have condemned him."

The retort was too appropriate, the reasoning too logical, to be gainsaid. Mary knew, as well as the Countess of Shrewsbury, that Elizabeth could not coerce the nobility into condemning Norfolk, and that many of those who sat on the trial would far rather have discovered a loophole for acquittal, than have found themselves, driven by the evidence, to return a verdict of guilty. Many of the judges of Norfolk were but a few shades less involved in treason than himself; but when the evidence was laid before them, they could not, for very shame, belie

their honour and acquit him. All this Mary felt, and the consciousness of Norfolk's just condemnation made her mute before the warm-tongued Countess. "The Queen," says Sadler, "thereupon with mourning, became silent, and had no will to talk more on the matter, and so like a true lover she remaineth still mourning for her lover." The old man's heart was touched with pity for the exalted and interesting captive, and though his reason told him not to be deceived, his pen involuntarily revealed the existence of a tenderness for one whom he had held in his arms as an infant. Steeling himself against such folly, he added, "God I trust will put it into the Queen's Majesty's heart so to provide for herself, that such true lovers may receive such rewards and fruits of their love, as they have very justly deserved at her Majesty's hands."[1]

Sadler's task at Sheffield was now nearly completed, and most cordially did he rejoice in the prospect of deliverance. He was tired of leading what he was pleased to term "an idle life," though his entertainment was "better than he deserved." His presence seemed a trouble to the Queen of Scots, and, unless she came out of her chamber, he seldom intruded himself into her company, trusting to the continual care of the Countess of Shrewsbury, who, he says, "is seldom from her." He was anxious to discharge his duty with as little annoyance to Mary as possible, and was perhaps a little hurt at the coldness with which she met, what he intended to be, delicate politeness. Very anxiously

[1] Sadler to Burghley, Jan. 21.—*Strickland*, v. 1, pp. 246-249.

he sought to hasten the Earl of Shrewsbury's return, saying:—

"My Lord Shrewsbury hath a costly guest of me, for I and my men, and thirty-six horses, do all lie and feed here at his charges, and therefore the sooner he come home, the better for him. Trusting his Lordship be now on his way, therefore I forbear to write to him. But if he be there, it may please you to tell him that all is well here, and that my Lady and I do long to see his Lordship; and as I doubt not she would most gladly have him here, so am I sure she cannot long for him more than I do, looking hourly to have some good news of your Lordship, of my return."[1]

Ten days later he wrote again, wondering that he had heard nothing from Court, and remarking he could not conceive of any needful cause for Lord Shrewsbury's long delay. He was never so weary of any service as of this. Of Mary, he adds:—

"The Queen has of herself become a close prisoner. She has not been out of her chamber since the Duke's condemnation, but is fallen into great contemplation, fasting and prayer. She observes three days of abstinence a week, Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, which they say she never did before. She thinketh, I trow, with her fasting and praying, to preserve or prolong the Duke's life, the rather thereby to work more trouble and mischief. God give her grace to repent and amend her own life, which hitherto hath been very loose and dissolute."[2]

On the first of February, in her liveliest vein, Elizabeth proceeded to place matters in form for the release of Sadler, and the return of Shrewsbury to his charge. She wrote a sarcastic letter to the Queen of Scots, begging her to qualify her passions, and reflect that it is not the way to get good things

[1] Sadler to Burghley, Jan. 21.—*Strickland*, v. 1, p. 246.

[2] Sadler to Burghley, Jan. 31.—*Cott. MSS.*, *Caligula*, c. III., 195.

by evil speeches and challenges, and by doing ill to herself.[1]

To Sadler, she said playfully :—

"Although you took your journey thither, and the charge there of the Queen by our commandment, yet we think you will come readily from thence without any commandment, so you have but our licence, and that not for misliking of your usage there, which we hear is very good. And therefore now, upon the return thither of our cousin, the Earl of Shrewsbury, in whom surely we find great cause of trust, we licence you to return ; not doubting but shortly to see you, and then hear of things there past under your charge."[2]

To the Earl of Shrewsbury Elizabeth entrusted a document setting forth her complaints against the Queen of Scots, as reasons for not answering her letters ; and Shrewsbury himself, with his usual disposition to be practical, applied to Lord Burghley for a warrant for the money due to him for the diet of his prisoner. On the 2nd February, Shrewsbury's arrangements were completed, and that day, or the next, he took horse for Sheffield, whence we find him writing on the 7th that he had detained Sadler one day that he might hear the Queen of Scots' answers to the several notes which he delivered to her.[3] Shrewsbury found Mary as impatient of restraint as ever, fretting at her imprisonment, and answering Elizabeth's charges with counter-complaints of treacherous and insincere dealing. To soothe her irritation, and gain some credit for kindly consideration, he granted the Queen the indulgence of a walk abroad. It was the depth of

[1] Elizabeth to Mary, Feb. 1.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VIII., No. 6.

[2] *Sadler Papers*, v. 2, p. 418, where the document is erroneously dated 1570.

[3] Shrewsbury to Burghley, Feb. 7.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VIII., No. 13.

winter, but so eager was the captive for exercise, that she was "content to step over the shoes in the snow." [1]

Shrewsbury and Sadler presented, with considerable formality, Elizabeth's "Memoir" of complaints, reading it aloud, but refusing to furnish a copy, and Mary finding she must trust to her memory in framing her answer, "at great leisure," wrote her mind to her Majesty. She was fortunate in obtaining so much indulgence as to be permitted to argue. Could the wisest of English statesmen have acted according to their judgment at this crisis, the Queen of Scots would have found herself face to face with the executioner instead of bandying words with members of the Privy Council.

On his return to Sheffield, Shrewsbury was much occupied in tracing out and intercepting the Queen of Scots' correspondence, and the consequence of his vigilance was the detection of various letter carriers, and the closing of several channels of communication.

Queen Elizabeth, in conversation with Shrewsbury, during his stay in London, expressed doubts as to the fidelity of one of his servants, Thomas Morgan, and the Earl remembered "his fond busy head always seeking to deal with other men's matters." Morgan was therefore one of the first objects of the Earl's attention on his return to Sheffield. As soon as he had settled the matters more immediately relating to the Queen of Scots, he examined Morgan's life in divers ways, and it was confessed and testified by sundry of his faction, that he

[1] Shrewsbury to Burghley, Feb. 14.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VIII., No. 16.

and two more of the Earl's men, and others living in the town of Sheffield, had carried divers letters from the Queen, and Morgan was accounted one of her sure friends. With a leniency that seems to indicate that he felt some kindness for this "fond busy" fellow, the Earl merely discharged him from his service, binding him to appear before any of the Privy Council when summoned.[1] This treatment was too mild for the temper of the Court, and Burghley wrote at once directing Morgan's apprehension and conveyance to London. But the "lewd fellow" had made good use of his time, and got out of the way. Shrewsbury heard that he had gone to York, and wrote to Sir Thomas Gargrave to search his writings, and apprehend him.[2] Again he was too late. Morgan left York for London before Shrewsbury's mandate arrived, intending to call on Mr. Roger Manners, at Belvoir, on his way. The Earl at once took measures of the most energetic kind. Despatching a messenger to Belvoir, to intercept Morgan if he should carry out his intention of calling on Mr. Manners, he sent another man post haste to London, to acquaint Burghley with the state of the case, in order that Morgan might be met with at his first coming, lest he should hear that his companions had been taken, and withdraw himself. "He commonly lodges in Holborn," remarks Shrewsbury.[3]

Morgan was but one among a nest of friends who

[1] Shrewsbury to Burghley, Feb. 28.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VIII., No. 18.
[2] Shrewsbury to Burghley, March 4.—*MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. VIII., No. 21.
[3] Shrewsbury to Burghley, March 6.—*MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. VIII., No. 22.

served the Queen of Scots to the best of their ability. The others, Shrewsbury "punished and put away as they deserved." Cuthbert Rede, the servant of the Bishop of Ross; Theophilus Kynlough, a learned man or conjurer; Caldwell, a schoolmaster; and Nycolson, a porter, all dealers for this Queen, says Shrewsbury, haunt one Gree's house in Staining lane, London, ale brewer. These men sought and sent her intelligence from her friends to and fro. Morgan and Cuthbert Rede, he continues, know where John Coutberd is, and so does Kynlough. Ryse, a Thames waterman, with a little squint, was Morgan's man, and conveyed letters between London and the Scotch Queen. One of these messengers was conveying letters from the Queen before Christmas, but, fearing the search, he hid them under a stone, upon the bare ground, for a more convenient season, and Shrewsbury in his search found them there, and sent them to Burghley.[1] One was addressed by Mary to the Duke of Alva, "wherein she maketh plain mention of the practice of Ridolfi, imputing the discovery thereof to the negligence of others, and not of herself. Another of the letters was to Grange and Lethington, to confirm them to stand fast, and to expect money from the Duke of Alva, with the Lord Seton." "The third letter," says Burghley, "is not yet deciphered."[2]

In the same letter, Burghley mentioned the apprehension of Rede, Theophilus, and the rest of the London companions, of whose place of resort Shrews-

[1] Shrewsbury to Burghley, Feb. 28.—*MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. VIII., No. 18.

[2] Burghley to Shrewsbury, March 4.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 64.

bury had informed him, in his letter of the 28th February, and he enclosed an extract from a letter of Lord Hunsdon's, dated the same day, saying:—

"They have also advertised me from the Regent of a certain boy that should come lately out of England, with letters to the Castle of Edinburgh, and is to return back again within three or four days. I have written to Sir John Forster to lay wait for him within his wardenry, as I will do within mine, and if your Lordship have any occasion to send where the Scotch Queen lieth, it were not amiss that my Lord of Shrewsbury had warning of him. His letters be sewed in the buttons and seams of his coat. His coat is of black English freise; he hath a cut on his left cheek, from his eye down, by the which he may be well known."

Shrewsbury at once put his scouts on the alert, but he doubted the lad's coming within his reach, as he had lately punished in the pillory "such men and their resetters." One month's vigilance sufficed to break up most of Mary's channels of communication. By the 9th of March, Shrewsbury was able to say with truth, "I have bolted forth her carriers of letters as far as Carlisle [altered from Ripon], and have sent for some of them, and some, hearing what stir I made, is fled."[1]

These proceedings very naturally offended the Queen of Scots. On the 4th March, Shrewsbury wrote:—

"This lady continues in her stormy manner and threatenings towards me, although she well understands that I make no more account than cause requires."[2]

On the 6th he says:—

"The Queen is still more unquiet, and all because she finds

[1] Shrewsbury to Bateman, March 9.—*MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. VIII., No. 23.
[2] Shrewsbury to Burghley.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VIII., No. 21.

her passages stopped, and can have no favour at my hands. That she allegeth to be her grief. She intends to write to the Queen."[1]

On the 9th, writing to his "loving friend, Mr. John Bateman, at Shrewsbury Place, in London," he says:—

"This Queen was never so unquiet since I had her, for that I have so deciphered her doing, that now she is to entertain new friends to serve her turn withal, and to get more French crowns to give them. This hinders her turn marvellously."[2]

These rigorous proceedings proved alike satisfactory to the Government and to Lord Shrewsbury, and he continued zealously to earn the good opinion of his sovereign. Writing on the 15th April, he says:

"I am glad of your recovered health. Have written to Lord Scrope what is confessed against Robbe Gryne of the Falde and Haltenge Wyllson, as you will see by the enclosed notes. It is further testified that Ledar, this Queen's man, being last summer sent by Duke Hambleton and others of Scotland with letters to her, and laid for upon the frontiers, came to Robbe Gryne's house and was kept there secretly eight days, and then Gryne sent his man with him to be his guard, who I think was apprehended by the way. One Base, a footboy, was sent by Lady Levinston with letters from Scotland to the Queen, and carried a letter from the said lady to Gryne, requiring him to see the bearer conveyed past Carlisle, and stayed two nights in his house. In Gryne's chamber, he and Wylson told the footboy to put on worse clothes, lest he should be searched. Wylson is known to have been a common carrier of letters to and from this Queen all last summer. I have sent Lord Scrope the contents of the former examination. Sheffield Castle, 15 April, 1572."[3]

[1] Shrewsbury to Burghley.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VIII., No. 22.

[2] Shrewsbury to Bateman, March 9.—*MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. VIII., No. 23.

[3] Shrewsbury to Burghley.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VIII., No. 36. *Hol.* p. 1. *Add. Endd.*

Again on the 10th May, the following communication is made :—

"On the 9th inst. came hither a Scot named Douglas, with a testimonial under the seal of Edinborough town, witnessing of a journey he had into France. He passed as he saith by Anvyke (Alnwick), Morpyth and Nucastell, with very little search or none at all. He had a leather bag containing his baggage, with a double bottom, in which were the letters hereinclosed, very cunningly fastened, safe from wet, fretting, and unlike to be sought for. He will not acknowledge that he was aware of them, or any other thing material. I keep him in close prison until he utter something. It were not amiss to charge the officers of those parts to have better regard to like persons. 'Now I may think myself and business from the parliament and feast quite forgot.' Sheffield Castle, 10 May, 1572."[1]

We need scarcely wonder at the impatience of Mary Stuart under this interruption of her correspondence. The letters of the Earl of Shrewsbury, during the spring and early summer, abound with passages which show the hot indignation with which the Queen of Scots regarded the frustration of her plans, and the effect that disappointment and vexation had on her health. "This Queen by unquiet and melancholy fits is sometimes grieved with passions of her old disease,"[2] wrote Shrewsbury on the 4th April. Again on Easter day, April 6th, he writes :—"This Queen is so discontented with all my doings as the hearing of a parliament will not quiet her."[3]

"Hearing of a parliament" was scarcely likely to "quiet her," for the parliaments of Elizabeth had

[1] Shrewsbury to Burghley.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VIII., No. 44. *Hol.* p. 1. *Add. Endd.*

[2] Shrewsbury to Burghley.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VIII., No. 34.

[3] Shrewsbury to Burghley.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VIII., No. 35.

shown a strong tendency to puritanism; and the one now summoned, while the Duke of Norfolk's treasons were still fresh, was not likely to look more favourably on the pretensions of the Catholic heir to the crown. The Queen of Scots had counted much on the support of the Duke of Alva, the butcher of the Netherlands, and if there was one thing that the English people dreaded and detested more than another, it was cruelty such as that with which Alva had sought to win back to Philip his revolted provinces. The stories of Alva's atrocities had caused English ears to tingle, and had prompted English hearts to join the Prince of Orange in his gallant resistance; and was Alva to be invited to England? Not with the consent of Englishmen; and if the Queen of Scots and the Duke of Norfolk were pleased to invite him, let them bear the responsibility and endure the obloquy.

Mary did not like the prospect of a parliament. The more she thought of it the more distasteful it seemed, and the more ominous for her prospects. On the 22nd April, Shrewsbury wrote:—

"She is now in her melancholy disease, and seemeth to despair of life, which groweth upon her misliking of this parliament, whereof she oft talketh, and mindeth to write thereof to the Queen's Majesty. She is newly entered into physic, and bestoweth much labour of herself." [1]

On the 30th April, Mary would have taken up her pen to write to Elizabeth, had not a rheum settled in her arm, making it impossible for her to use her hand. Accordingly she called in the aid of her secre-

[1] Shrewsbury to Burghley.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VIII., No. 38.

tary, and dictated an appeal and a protest. She complained that her letters had not been answered; why, she was at a loss to conceive. Would Elizabeth resume the treaty with her or not? Would she accept her reasonable offers, or reject them altogether? It was time to do something, even if it amounted to no more than permitting her to have clothes, and other necessaries, such as at the least were permitted to prisoners.

"For the rest, Madam, being detained in your hands, where I placed myself of my own free will, in good faith, and under the expectation of the friendship which you promised to me, and finding myself finally reduced to such extremity that you do not allow any of my people, ambassadors or others, to have access to you (on which account I have no hesitation in saying that my adversaries are improving the opportunity and striving to injure me, and in particular are working against my right to the succession after you), I have constrained myself, by this letter, not having any other means, to protest that, if in any parliament an attempt is made to do anything to the prejudice of my right after you, my intention is to oppose such attempt, and to contest it in the assembly of a parliament, by myself or my representatives, as soon as I am permitted to present, or cause to be presented to you, a humble petition for this purpose." [1]

In such lofty strains did the captive address the Queen of England, vainly seeking, under cover of an affected boldness, to conceal her extreme anxiety. But the appearance could not be kept up. Before concluding her letter the tone altered. After speaking of the rheum in her arm, Mary says:—

"And if I did not fear to importune you too much, I should ask you to allow me to go to the baths at Buxton, which are

[1] Mary to Elizabeth.—*Labanoff*, v. IV., p. 42.

near here, with such precautions as it may please you to order; for I believe it would give relief to that [the rheum in her arm] and to my side, by which I am very much tormented."

This representation of the state of her health was fully confirmed by the Earl of Shrewsbury, who wrote the morning after Mary had concluded her letter to the Queen:—"She is unquiet and sickly, and if she dissemble not, unlike to continue long."[1]

Again, on the 4th of May, the Earl said:—

"The Queen of Scots is by continual unquiet so grieved with her old disease, and oft using over night 'bane' and physic, as doubteth a palsy, for she saith she wanteth strength and use of her left arm. My opinion is, her fear of this parliament easeth nothing of her heart at all, neither do I think Buxton well can cure her maladies. It appeareth by her stout speech and threatenings, she minds by her oft letters, ere the parliament end, to put your Majesty in remembrance of such demands as she wrote of to your Majesty, wherein knowing your Majesty's pleasure I shall stay or suffer them [to] pass as your Majesty commandeth. Sheffield Castle, 4 May, 1572."[2]

Mary, too, had another device with which to propitiate Elizabeth. She knew the frugal, not to say penurious, habits of the Queen of England, and she appealed to her by presents. The captive, who had been pleading at the end of April for clothes such as were allowed to prisoners, was able in May to send to the Queen of England, by the hand of John de Compeigne, her tailor, a present consisting of stuffs, satin, taffetas, hats, linen, and other things. The exaggeration of her plea for clothes was exposed; but she had the satisfaction of placing the

[1] Shrewsbury to Burghley, May 1.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VIII., No. 40.

Shrewsbury to Burghley, May 4.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VIII., No. 41. *Hol.* p 1. *Add. Endd.*

Queen of England in the position of accepting presents at the hand of a dangerous rival.

On the 19th April, Sir Francis Walsingham and Sir Thomas Smith concluded a treaty with France, which must have convinced Mary that her prospects of help from that country were small; and in addition to this discouragement came the meeting of the English Parliament, on the 8th of May. The two houses were not slow to indicate their feeling against the Queen of Scots; but it was in the Commons that the zeal for her destruction burned most brightly. A joint committee of Peers and Commons met to consider "how to proceed with the Scotch Queen," and the Commons resolved to attaint her. The Upper House of Convocation, also, with profuse scriptural allusion, exhibited a writing to the Queen's Majesty, at St. James's, to move her to assent to justice against the Queen of Scots. On the 28th May, Elizabeth received a joint deputation of the two Houses of Parliament, which asked, first, for the execution of the Queen of Scots; secondly, for a declaration that whoever maintained the rights of that Princess to the crown of England was guilty of treason; and thirdly, that the sentence against the Duke of Norfolk might be carried out.

As to the Queen of Scots, Elizabeth was immoveable. "She could not put to death the bird that had flown to her for succour from the hawk;" but she gave way to the pressure as regarded the Duke of Norfolk, and he was executed on the 2nd of June. The remainder of the session was occupied in the discussion of a bill "to make the

Scottish Queen unable and unworthy of succession to the Crown;" and when, on the 30th of June, Elizabeth came, as was supposed, to give her royal assent to the measure, she prorogued Parliament to October, and said she would think about the bill.

This summary of events happening in London and Paris, is needful to enable us to understand the proceedings of the Queen of Scots.

The Castle of Sheffield was kept well supplied with the news, but it was not such news as Mary wanted. Lord Shrewsbury read to her the "writing" of the Bishops in Convocation, and she remarked, "it is full of blood." He told her of the joint committee, and the resolution to introduce a bill of attainder, and after observing the effect of his communication, he wrote to Burghley:

"She has at present one of her old sickly fits and is somewhat weaker than when I last wrote, greatly discontented that she wants intelligence." [1]

Speaking for herself, Mary says to M. de la Mothe,

"My head is so full of rheum, and my eyes so swelled with such continual sickness and fever, that I am obliged to keep entirely in my bed, where I have but little rest, and am in a bad condition, so that I cannot now write with my hand." [2]

The news of Norfolk's execution, quickly followed the intelligence about the bill of attainder. "Wnpleasant newes," Mary called it in writing to Burghley. She tells M. de la Mothe that Lord Shrewsbury had informed her of the Duke of Norfolk's execution, of the parliamentary proceedings against her, and of Elizabeth's resolution not to have her life taken,

[1] Shrewsbury to Burghley, May 28.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VIII, No. 49.
[2] Mary to La Mothe.—*Strickland*, v. I, p. 252.

and she adds, "I am only beginning to support myself, after having done all I could by medicines and bathing to allay the continual torment of my side. At this news I have become worse than before."[1]

At the same time the following letter was sent by the Earl of Shrewsbury to Lord Burghley:—

"I cannot find in this Queen any other mind than as I wrote, though I have often talked with her since. She still continueth great enmity and giveth no hope of other intent. It is too plain her heart is over hardened with deadly hate against the Queen's Majesty; the more therefore her Majesty's safety is to be thought upon. She fell, by grief of the Duke's death, into a passion of sickness, as I last wrote, and so hath she ever since continued and kept her bed. Her people seem to doubt her escape Saturday next, and if she be so sick in deed as in appearance she seemeth, and her people make report of, she is like hardly to escape. I will write no more, but refer you to the report of the letters sent herewith.—Sheffield Castle, 10th June, 1572."[2]

Two days later Shrewsbury writes again:—

"I have, ever sithens I last wrote to your lordship of this Queen's sickness, because she and her people made such semblance of extremity and peril of her life, observed as well their manners as course of her sickness, and thereby do plainly see they neither are now in any fear of her death, nor she, although weakened by over much physic and banes [*baths*], and something disposed to mourn and bewail the Duke's death, keepeth her bed for a time, and is unlike to recover her strength and walk abroad very shortly. Thus much, for that her sickness was made so grievous unto me and the danger so imminent, I thought meet to advertise your lordship what I think of her present estate.—Sheffield Castle, 12th June, 1572."[3]

[1] *Strickland*, v. 1, p. 251.

[2] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VIII., No. 50.—*Hol.*, p. 1. *Add. Endd.*

[3] Shrewsbury to Burghley.—*Hol.*, p. 1. *Add. Endd. MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VIII., No. 57.

One of the devices by which Elizabeth sought to evade the importunity of Parliament and of Convocation was to send commissioners to the Queen of Scots, with a long list of charges against her, to which they were to require her answers. When this idea was first mooted, Shrewsbury expressed his desire that Lord Burghley might be one of the commissioners, and pleaded that Lady Shrewsbury stood in great need of his further advice at Chatsworth.[1]

The occasion was not serious enough to deserve Burghley's personal attention. It was an empty concession for the sake of appearances, and he was too much impressed with the danger his mistress incurred in protecting the Queen of Scots, to care to be an actor in any of the pretended arrangements. Lord de la Warr, Sir Ralph Sadler, Doctor Wilson, and Sir Thomas Bromley, Solicitor-general, were selected, and they, together with the Earl of Shrewsbury, propounded to the Queen of Scots thirteen articles of accusation.[2] Mary protested "as Queen of Scotland, a free and sovereign princess," that she would not submit to any jurisdiction of the Queen of England; but having the honour to be nearest of blood, and right of succession, and also desiring to satisfy her good sister, she consented to confer fully with the commissioners, and answered their charges. As to the assumption of the style and arms of England while in France, she pleaded the authority of her husband, and the orders of the

[1] Shrewsbury to Burghley, May 28.—*MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. VIII., No. 49.
[2] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VIII., No. 53.

French King, her father-in-law, and said she had not used them since the death of her husband, the King of France, and had always been willing to renounce all claim to the crown of England during the life of the Queen's Majesty, and during the continuance of any heirs of her body. As to the Norfolk marriage, she had no ill intention towards the present state of the Queen's Majesty. She denied any privy knowledge of the rebellion in the North, or any relief of the rebels, except the Countess of Northumberland, whom she recommended to the Duke of Alva. As to the charge of inviting aid from foreign princes, she desired to make declaration of her meaning in the Parliament of England. She knew Ridolfi to be an agent of the Pope, and as she wanted money from the Pope, sought to obtain some through his means. (She had previously denied most solemnly any knowledge of Ridolfi.) Mary pleaded guilty to seeking her liberty, to receiving letters from the Pope, but not letters offering pardon to rebels against Elizabeth; and she denied utterly, procuring the Pope's bull against the Queen, or directing her friends abroad to say that she ought to be Queen of England.

Of the sincerity of these declarations the reader will be able to judge, who has followed the course of the preceding narrative. They deceived nobody who knew anything of the facts, and only added another to many solemnly affirmed mendacities. Nothing, of course, came of the negotiations, and the commissioners returned to London.

The following letter from Shrewsbury, which is

rather more descriptive than usual, gives us a little insight into the manner in which strangers visiting the Queen were deceived as to the extent of liberty she enjoyed:—

"Permitted Mons. Dardoye to deliver his letters to this lady, and converse with her in my sight, according to the Queen's pleasure as expressed in your letters. 'She rejoiced much of his coming, and as it seemed, thought the time short whilst she talked with him, which I thought the longer for that I did not understand or well hear their talk. She would gladly have sent up letters by him without delivering them to me. When she saw I would not grant thereunto, she delivered the letters to me before him, and told them (sic) that he might witness how many were delivered me, which needed not, for if there be any matter of importance it is committed to his report, and that might be well understood, though not in plain terms, I thought no less.' I found it best to avoid conference between him and her people, to lodge him in the town, and appointed some of my servants to attend upon him, and sent him wine and other things from my house, and defrayed his expenses. To show him that she had liberty to walk, I brought her to a stand near my house, where she saw four or five courses, so that he may witness she is not so strictly kept as she has reported. 'I had almost forgotten when she had delivered me her letters to be packed which she hath sent, and not made me privy unto them, I wished her that she would send them open, which she refused so to do, and bad me open them if I thought good, in so much I said before Dardoye I meant to open them for my discharge, though I thought I should receive blame thereby at the Queen's Majesty's hands, so that if it please the Queen's Majesty to open them, her Highness may blame my rashness in opening them thus, having a good will to do that lieth in me to serve her Majesty, whom I pray God long may reign over us.' Sheffield Castle, 7th July 1572."[1]

[1] Shrewsbury to Burghley.—*Hol.* p. 2. *Add. Endd.* "By Dardoy, Montmorence's Secretary."—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VIII., No. 63. The Stand from which the hunting was witnessed was probably a hunting tower on the site of the farm now called Stand House, in Sheffield Park.

CHAPTER X.

THE month of August, 1572, was destined to leave its mark on the history of Europe. Elizabeth had set her face against proceeding to the prosecution of the Queen of Scots, and Mary had graciously thanked her; hoping "as her Majesty had respected the justice of her cause in one point, she could do so in others; and that her enemies would not attempt to prejudice Her Majesty farther against her."[1] Mary's friends in Scotland had become alive to the fact that France had deserted them, and Maitland impressed upon his mistress the necessity of winning the confidence of the Queen of England.[2] Burghley and the English statesmen were uneasy at the position of affairs, but unable to effect an immediate change. In an attitude of careful attention they watched every movement, scarcely knowing in what direction to look for a danger they felt to be impending; but the wildest imagination failed to anticipate the catastrophe of St. Bartholomew.

At the end of July, Marcial de Jos came to

[1] Shrewsbury to Burghley, July 9.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VIII., No. 65.

[2] Lethington to Mary, Aug. 10, but not deciphered till Dec. 5. "I wold wishe your Majestie, seing how slack a part France hes tane with you, suld essay yet be all meanes gif ye may wonne the Quene of England, for I see not be quhat other meanes your relief can be wrocht, and it may be gif ye make hir good offers, she will now schaw you mair favour nor sche did quhen ye had ma freindis."—*Wright's Queen Elizabeth and her Times*, v. 1, p. 432.

Sheffield, from the French Ambassador, with £500 for the Scots' Queen. He had a short conversation with her in the presence of the Earl of Shrewsbury,

"Containing no matter of importance as far as I could gather," says the Earl, "neither did he deliver any letters, tokens, or privy message unto her, or any belonging unto her, for I used straight order to keep him from company or speech with any of them. She hath now sent letters by him unto her Majesty, and also to the Ambassador; which letters I thought meet to enclose in a packet directed under my seal unto your Lordship, that they may be used there as shall stand with her Majesty's pleasure."[1]

A few days later, the following communication was sent by Shrewsbury to Burghley:—

"I received your letter yesterday, by Fabian, one of the French Ambassador's secretaries, and allowed him to move the Queen for his matter of money in my hearing.

"Thought good to open and peruse the letters he brought her from the Ambassador, having no warrant to the contrary; and because they contained the Queen's answers to her late petitions (written by him in temperate manner), viz., as to going to Buxton, that her Majesty deferred it till next year, as the house is not finished; and as to her repair to her Majesty at Kenilworth, the time would in no wise serve thereto; and as to more liberty and more servants, order was given me therein.

"Cannot assent to that request, doubting not only more practices, but more ministers for executing them.

"On reading the letters, she seemed not a little troubled, and said, 'This is the third time, at least, that I have sued unto the Queen, and offered my goodwill, and seeing I cannot be accepted nor relieved at her hands, I will never more desire her, nor trust unto her, but will commit my causes unto the French King.'

"I remember she used such speeches about a year ago, when her chief trust and practice was with the Spaniard. She asked the bearer for news from Scotland. He said there was

[1] Shrewsbury to Burghley, August 2.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 65.

an abstinence for two months, at the end of which he thought she would hear of some peaceable agreement, 'whereat she somewhat stormed, saying that there should be no agreement unless she were a party and made privy thereto.'

"In the Ambassador's letter, there was credit referred to the bearer, but I would not allow him to enter into any discourse with her or hers, by word or writing. She was very angry, but I made little account thereof. Will be as careful and circumspect as ever, and more so, if I may, to avoid all danger of her escape and practice. I am still desirous of making my advertisements principally to you, [Burghley had been made Lord Treasurer on the 13th July, and therefore might have ceased his correspondence as Secretary,] because I have by long experience found you my very good friend, in declaring my true and faithful meaning. Sheffield Castle, 16th Aug."[1]

These visits led to representations on the part of the French Ambassador for better treatment of the Queen of Scots. Lord Burghley, replying to Shrewsbury's letter, writes on the 23rd August, from "Compton in the Hole, so well called for a deep valley." He says:—

"The Queen's Majesty liketh your letters brought to me by Sabran, the French Ambassador's man, and especially the continuance of your plain dealing with your charge. And upon the Ambassador's earnest motion, her Majesty is content and would have your Lordship, if you think it not inconvenient, to confer with that Queen upon the number of her servants, wherein she findeth lack, and how she would have the same supplied, for the French Ambassador saith she lacketh servitors for her necessary service, in that some one serveth in two or three rooms [offices]. And as your Lordship shall find the lack indeed necessary, so is her Majesty content that your Lordship shall of your own discretion supply the same, or otherwise advertise her Majesty thereof. Secondly, it is required that the said Queen might have some one of her servants come out of France,

[1] *Signed*, p. 2. *Add. Endd.*, Aug. 16, 1572.—*Cotton MSS. Caligula*, c. III., 384.

to inform her of her accounts there, and that she might send some letters into France for that purpose. Whereunto her Majesty is thus pleased; that she shall write open letters of her instructions, to be seen by your Lordship, and sent hither with your letters to the Ambassador; and otherwise her Majesty will not that she shall send any person from hence."[1]

Mary had now been more than a year-and-a-half at Sheffield, without any change of residence, and Shrewsbury, finding that a more lenient dealing was the order of the day, conceived the opportunity a good one to give his captive a little change, and to clean her rooms. His house on the hill above Sheffield, about two miles from the Castle, afforded a convenient place to which to remove her without going beyond his own domain; but when the time came for putting the plan into execution his resolution failed him, the dangers seemed so great.

Writing to Lord Burghley on the 26th August, Shrewsbury says :—

"I thought to remove this Queen to my Lodge. Now finding the place where she is safer than I looked for, and considering if any practices should be used, betwixt this and Hallowtide is the fittest time to put it in use, therefore I mind not to remove her at all, unless it be for five or six days, to cleanse her chamber, being kept very uncleanly. She is desirous of new men, and send these abroad, which if by the Ambassador's means may be obtained at the Queen's Majesty's hands, will bring new devices. Now she is meetly quiet, saving she mislikes she cannot go a hunting into the fields upon horseback, which I trust the Queen's Majesty will not assent unto, unless she minds to set her at liberty."[2]

Thus were the Queen, Burghley, and Shrewsbury weighing the arguments advanced on behalf of

[1] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 69. [2] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 68.

the Queen of Scots, and conceding as far as they safely could, her requests. Whether she went to the Lodge, even for five or six days, or remained in her "uncleanly" rooms, does not appear. Projects of this kind, and all discussions about enlarging her number of servants, were abruptly closed by the news then already on its way from Paris.

France, where the religious wars between Catholics and Huguenots had engendered the utmost bitterness, lay ready to ignite at the first spark. The hatred of the Catholics against the Protestants was intense, and it suited the purposes of the Guise faction to fan the flame of passion. In England, on the 22nd August, the Earl of Northumberland, treacherously and meanly surrendered by the Regent of Scotland for a bag of 2000 pounds, was beheaded at York, for the part he took in the rebellion of 1569. On the same day, in Paris, Admiral Coligny, the leader of the French Protestants, was shot from a window opposite the Louvre, and seriously wounded. Lord Burghley, writing on the 27th, when the Court was at Woodstock, referred to this attempt, and said:—

"Our news out of France are strange. The Admiral, having waited on the King to tennis at his return to Paris, was shot at out of a house belonging to a follower of the Duke of Guise, with a calliver, having three bullets; and his forefinger of his right hand stricken off with one pellet, his wrist of his left arm shot through in two places, and hereupon he is fallen sick of a fever, somewhat dangerously." [1]

It has been surmised, with great appearance of

[1] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 70.

probability, that the Guise faction hoped by this act to provoke the Protestants to retaliation. Failing in this, they found it needful to wade still deeper into blood. On the morning of the 24th August, of all the days of the week a Sunday, Coligny was stabbed in his bed, and his body flung into the court-yard, where the Duke of Guise stood impatiently waiting the completion of the deed. Thus commenced the famous Massacre of St. Bartholomew. After Coligny, the other leaders of the Protestants were slain, and, the demon of destruction being let loose, Paris for three days ran with blood. Private hate and religious bigotry did their work, and more than 4000 persons perished.

The controversy was distinctly a religious one, and the points of it were the same as those whose discussion in England made the presence of the Queen of Scots so dangerous. The news of the massacre was received in London not only with the horror that such a crime would naturally excite, but was regarded as the herald of a general attack on all the Protestants of Europe. Elizabeth's life was believed to be menaced, or, as Leicester phrased it in a letter to Shrewsbury,—

"God defend our mistress from the hidden practices laid for her among these open facts committed so nearly to touch her; for she is the fountain and the well-spring of the griefs that procureth this malice, and though others smart, yet she is the mark they shoot at." [1]

The sensation was intense, and instinctively every man's mind turned to the captive at Sheffield, the

[1] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 76.

rallying point of the Catholics of England. If Burghley could have had his way, there would have been a short shrift and a sharp axe for the Queen of Scots, but fortune still favoured the "fair devil."

The events in France only moved the Queen of England so far as to evoke orders for the more careful watching of her prisoner, but at the same time she set her cunning intellect to work in devising a way of getting rid of the Queen of Scots, without seeming to be the author of her death. All through Elizabeth's dealings with this woman, a dread of the harsh construction of mankind was apparent. She might have tried and executed Mary, or she might have procured her secret murder; but in either case the responsibility would have been hers. To the imputation of assassination she was especially sensitive, and whenever the Queen of Scots was sick, Elizabeth manifested the liveliest anxiety, sending physicians and medicines, lest peradventure she should die, and the world, in its uncharitableness, conclude that a death so convenient had not been unsought.

The proposed removal to Sheffield Manor for change of air, and the augmentation of her servants, which had been in contemplation during the summer, were alike forgotten. The strictest orders were sent to the Earl of Shrewsbury for the "straight keeping" of his charge. In hot haste, Elizabeth wrote directing the reduction of the Queen of Scots' servants to sixteen persons of all sorts.

The letter itself has perished, but a fragment which appears to have been its wrapper, remains

among the Talbot papers, and has been printed by Lodge. It is as follows :—

". . . After I had enclosed up these letters, her Majesty willed me to let your Lordship understand that she would have you use some speech to the Queen of Scots in this sort: That it is now fully discovered to her Majesty what practices that Queen hath had in hand, both with the Duke of Norfolk and others, upon the sending away of Ridolfi into Spain; and, though it is known to her Majesty, by writings extant, how she was in deliberation what were best for her to do for her escape out of this realm, and thereof caused the Duke of Norfolk to be conferred withal, and that she made choice rather to go into Spain than into Scotland or France, yet her Majesty thinketh it no just cause to be offended with those devices tending to her liberty: Neither is she offended with her purposes to offer her son in marriage to the King of Spain's daughter, in which matter the late Queen of Spain had solicited her; neither that she sought to make the King of Spain believe that she would give ear to the offer of Don John de Austria: But the very matter of offence is that her Majesty understandeth certainly her labours and devices to stir up a new rebellion in this realm, and to have the King of Spain to assist it; and finding the said Queen now so bent, she must not think but that her Majesty hath cause to alter her courteous dealings with her. And so, in this sort, her Majesty would have you tempt her patience, to provoke her to answer somewhat; for of all these premises her Majesty is certainly assured, and of much more.

" Her Majesty told me a while ago that a gentleman of my Lord of (I dare not name the party), coming to your Lordship's house, was by your Lordship asked whether he had seen the Queen of Scots or no, and he said no; then, quoth your Lordship, you shall see her anon; which offer her Majesty misliking, I said that I durst say it was not true in that matter. I perceive her Majesty would have that Queen kept very straitly from all conference, in so much it is more like that she shall be rather committed to ward then to have more liberty: Your

Lordship shall do well to send the names of those that shall remain, and of such as shall depart.

"Your Lordship's at command,

"W. B. *Sept.* 5.

"*The Queen's Majesty's Letters to the Earl of Shrewsbury. W. Burghley. Haste post, haste, haste, haste, for life, life, life, life, &c.*" [1]

These instructions were issued on the 5th September. On the 7th, Burghley wrote again, enclosing further letters from the Queen, which have perished; but his Lordship says of them:—

"I do also herewith send your Lordship her Majesty's letter concerning the Queen of Scots: which being written, her Majesty doubted that it was not earnestly enough written to keep the said Queen straight; and her Majesty hath no meaning that she should have any new servant at this time."

Referring to the events in France, Burghley adds:

"My Lord, these French tragedies and ending of unlucky marriage with blood and vile murders cannot be expressed with tongue to declare the cruelties. . . . These fires may be doubted that their flames may come both hither and into Scotland, for such cruelties have large scopes. God save our gracious Queen, who now assembleth her Council that may come to consult what is to be done for some surety. We have sent H. Killigrew this day into Scotland. The French Ambassador came yesterday to Oxford, with La Croc's son-in-law, that is come out of France to go into Scotland to sow seed of sedition, but the Queen's Majesty is not hasty to hear any of them. All men now cry out of your prisoner. The will of God be done." [2]

Whatever may have been the danger of the crisis, Shrewsbury was fully able to meet it. His fidelity to the Crown was of the greatest importance, and

[1] This letter is endorsed by the Earl's hand, "The Quene's Majesty's lettar of the v of Septembar, for the redusing of the Scotes Quene's nombar to xvi parsons of all sortes," and appears to have been the cover of the Queen's letter.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 71.

[2] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 74.

Elizabeth, to attach him anew to herself, conferred on him the office of Earl Marshal, vacant by the death and attainder of the Duke of Norfolk, the solitary and unsubstantial reward of a service destined to last so many years, to the Earl's heavy loss and great discomfort. He thanked his Sovereign for her "gracious gift," and, as though he fully appreciated the meaning of the favour, indulged her with ample assurances of his "true and faithful service."

Opportunities were seldom lacking to afford Shrewsbury occasions on which to show his zeal, and he did not neglect the present one. Strict search was made in every quarter to discover any means of communication that might have survived the scrutiny of the previous spring, or been organized since, and several ciphered letters rewarded the inquirers. These were sent at once to London, and seemed, as Shrewsbury says, to "show that there is great diligence used for her intelligence, and indicates some new device in hand. However she practises, I have no doubt, to keep her safe."[1]

Thus he wrote to the Queen. To Lord Burghley, he said:—

"I shall procure this Queen's contentment with the number of people she now hath, because she shall find no remedy. . . . I pray God her Majesty will regard her own safety. Doubt you not I shall look to this lady with as much care as for my own life. She shall not walk nor stir out of the house till her Majesty commands. I will do whatever I can further provide for her safe keeping."[2]

[1] Shrewsbury to Elizabeth, Sep. 15.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VIII., No. 72.
[2] Shrewsbury to Burghley, Sep. 15.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VIII., No. 73.

Writing more fully to Lord Burghley, on the 24th September, Shrewsbury says:—

"These are to advertise you that this Queen remains still within these four walls, in sure keeping; and those persons continue very quiet, thanked be God. She is most offended at my restraint from her walking without this castle, but for all her anger I will not suffer her to pass one of these gates until I have contrary commands expressly from the Queen's Majesty. And though I was fully persuaded that my number of soldiers was sufficient for her safe keeping, yet have I thought good this time to increase the same with thirty soldiers more, for the more terror of the evil disposed; and I have also given, and do keep, precise order, not only that no manner of conference shall be had with her, or any of her's, but also that no intelligence shall be brought to her, or any of them; and likewise I have given [orders] for walking and observing the woods and other places thereabout that are most to be suspect, to the end I may speedily understand of any resort or haunt of suspect persons, or of anything else meet to be known. Hereof I thought meet to advertise your lordship, that you may please declare the same, as ye think convenient, unto her Majesty, whom I beseech Almighty God preserve from all practices of her enemies; and so I end."[1]

The Earl's assurances and precautions satisfied the Court, and after the letters of the 7th September, no communication for many weeks was despatched to him.

On the 10th October, he reports to Burghley:—

"This lady complains of sickness by reason of her restraint of liberty in walking abroad, that I am forced to walk with her near unto my castle, which partly stays her from troubling the Queen's Majesty with her frivolous letters."[2]

Six days longer Shrewsbury waited and still no

[1] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 77.

[2] Shrewsbury to Burghley.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. VIII., No. 74.

letter from Court; but, worse than letters, came reports of Elizabeth's illness. It was said the Queen had got small-pox, a disease then as virulent as the plague, and as much dreaded. What was he to do? Any moment the news might reach him that Elizabeth was dead, and that his prisoner had been proclaimed her successor; or, perchance, he might not hear anything until an army of Catholic gentlemen appeared before his gates to claim their Queen. Shrewsbury had been faithful to Elizabeth, and thus secured the bitter hatred of Mary; and should the sceptre pass in this supreme moment of the nation's danger, from the Tudor to the Stuart, his head would be the inevitable forfeit. Shrewsbury's anxiety was extreme, and "in haste," "at eight in the night" of the 16th October, he wrote thus to Lord Burghley:

"My very good Lord Five weeks is past since I had any advertisements from your Lordship, which I think long; and now specially that it is spoken the Queen's Majesty hath been lately sick of the small-pox, and as yet no certainty is here of her Majesty's recovery or perfect health. You may be sure it is no little grief and discomfort to me. Judge me by yourself; our case is one. I am so desirous to hear of her Majesty's perfect recovery of health as to have presumed to crave of her Majesty's own hand writing a word or two for my more comfort. This Queen is safe, and all well here; and so I wish to your Lordship as well as to myself."[1]

Both Burghley and the Queen recognised the ground of Shrewsbury's anxiety, and his request for an assurance in the Queen's hand was speedily gratified. On the 22nd, a formal letter "By the Queen," to her "right well-beloved cousin and

[1] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 78.

counsellor," was duly drawn up. In this letter Elizabeth says:—

"True it is that we were about thirteen days past distempered, as commonly happens, in the beginning of a fever; but after two or three days, without any great inward sickness, there began to appear certain red spots in some part of our face, likely to prove the small-pox; but thanked be God, contrary to the expectation of our physicians and all others about us, the same so vanished away, as within four or five days passed no token almost appeared; and at this day, we thank God, we are so free from any token, or mark of any such disease, that none can conjecture any such thing."[1]

To this formal assurance, Elizabeth, with delicate flattery, added with her own hand—

"My faithful Shrewsbury,

"Let no grief touch your heart for fear of my disease; for I assure you, if my credit were not greater than my show, there is no beholder would believe that ever I had been touched with such a malady.

"Your faithful loving sovereign,

"Elizabeth R."[2]

This act of condescension had the desired effect. Shrewsbury was profoundly touched. The words written by the Queen's own hand, "far above the order used to a subject," make him think himself more happy than any of his "ansysters;" "and therefore do I mean," he says, "for a perpetual memory to preserve the same safely as a principal evidence of my great comfort to my posterity."[3]

This slight attack of small-pox was not, however, the only cause of Burghley's silence. Negotiations were then proceeding in Scotland of which we may well assume the Lord Treasurer was ashamed, and

[1] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 79. [2] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 80. [3] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 80.

which he was anxious to keep from the knowledge of Shrewsbury. We have seen from Burghley's letter of the 7th September, that on that day Mr. H. Killigrew was sent into Scotland, and Elizabeth, while professing to consult her Council, had really acted without waiting for their advice. Killigrew's ostensible mission was to seek the pacification of the troubles in Scotland, to request the nobles and others to take warning by the strange accident in France, in which the Admiral and a great number of the noblemen of the reformed religion had been murdered, and beg them to mark what efforts are being made to eradicate and destroy all such as shall make profession of the true religion, and that some efforts may be made by pensions and fair promises to entrap the nobility of Scotland.[1]

These instructions Killigrew had in writing, but he had other verbal instructions from the mouth of the Queen. He was to propose the surrender of the Queen of Scots to her subjects, on three conditions. First, that the Scots should prefer a request for her surrender; second, that Mary should be put to death as soon as she arrived in Scotland; and third, that the name of Elizabeth should not appear in the negotiation. The Regent Marr received the overture coldly. He saw clearly enough that Elizabeth wished to use him as a cat's-paw, and he was not to be caught. Marr was no friend of Queen Mary, but he was shrewd, and met Elizabeth's proposals with counter propositions that would have made the Queen of England share the responsibility of the

[1] *Dom. Eliz.*, v. 134, pp. 264, 463.—*MSS. Scotland*, v. 23, p. 361.

execution. He asked that the King of Scots should be taken under the special protection of the Queen of England; that the English Parliament should declare that any sentence against the Queen of Scots should not prejudice the rights of her son; that a league offensive and defensive should be concluded between England and Scotland; that the Earls of Huntingdon and Bedford, with 3000 English soldiers, should be present at the execution of Mary; that the English troops should assist in reducing the Castle of Edinburgh; and finally, that Elizabeth should pay the arrears due to the Scotch troops. Here, then, was a complete check-mate to Elizabeth. She asked for secresy; the Scots insisted upon her open complicity, and on this issue the negotiation fell through. It was to no purpose that Killigrew wrote obscurely of "a matter which they wot of," and expressed his hope that it should be brought to pass. He flattered himself that Morton would help if the Regent would not, and so "the great matter" be brought to pass; but as October rolled on, he discovered that "the matter they wot of was not likely to satisfy their expectation unless it be squared to better proportion;" and in November, he had discovered that there was "danger of a certain matter being spread abroad."[1]

Marr died at Stirling, on the 28th October, not without suspicion of poison, and in the arrangements to provide another Regent, Killigrew took an active part, in the midst of which his secret negotiation was lost sight of. When Morton had been

[1] Killigrew to Burghley.—*MSS. Scotland*, v. 23, No. 105 and 108.

installed, some faint efforts to reopen the question were made, but without effect; and after lingering in Killigrew's letters through the months of December and January, "the great matter,"—"the other matter" finally disappears.

But what of the Queen of Scots during the weary weeks, when the Earl of Shrewsbury was trembling at reports of Elizabeth's illness, and Elizabeth herself was plotting to secure by underhand means an execution she had not herself the moral courage to order? Shut out from all exercise and all intelligence, only kept from troubling Elizabeth with letters, by the indulgence of walking near to the Castle, well guarded, and in the Earl's company, Mary's health and spirits failed her. She dearly loved freedom, but now the iron of captivity was entering into her soul. Privations were making her prematurely old, and undermining her health. Her spirit chafed and fumed. Sometimes she would storm and threaten, at others she would entreat, but through all her varying moods Shrewsbury was provokingly calm, composedly watching her manifestations of pain and anger, as a cruel boy might look on the gyrations of a beetle impaled on a pin. At the beginning of December, he writes in a quiet matter of fact way to Burghley:—

"She is within a few days become more melancholy than of long before, and complains of her wrongs and imprisonment; and for remedy thereof seems not to trust her Majesty, but altogether in foreign powers. By her talk she would make appear as both France and Spain sought her and her son, and to keep them both her friends alike, forbears to write to any of them. She would cunningly persuade that Spain in Ireland,

and France in Scotland, intends some attempts. For Ireland, the Pope, she saith, hath licensed the King of Spain, as in his right long since. This speech of hers is not without her accustomed threatenings, nor shows less enmity than of old. My Lord, this her sudden disposition to talk so far of these matters, whereof a long time she hath seemed scarce to think (no occasion thereof being given by me), presumes some intended practice of hers to be lately overthrown, for sure I am her melancholy and grief is greater than she in words utters; and yet rather than continue this imprisonment she sticks not to say she will give her body, her son, and country for liberty." [1]

Shrewsbury, to add to his other troubles, was not without detractors. There were spies in his own household, and treacherous tongues at Court, to carry and to magnify every little incident, to distort occurrences, or invent fables, with the object of bringing the guardian of the Queen of Scots into disrepute. In this most trying year, when his exertions in the cause of his mistress had been more than usually conspicuous, the tongue of slander was also busy, and Elizabeth heard and listened to tales of his "undutiful dealing," and carelessness in his charge. The Countess had once been accused of favouring the Queen of Scots, and now the Earl's honour and fidelity were impeached. Elizabeth took council with her Lord Treasurer, and Burghley made light of the rumours, pointing out how strongly the known facts disproved general allegations. He felt it necessary, however, to inform Shrewsbury what was said, and to put him on his guard, a good office, for which the Earl gave him hearty thanks, and demanded the punishment of his slanderers, "that her Majesty may be fully satisfied and quiet."

[1] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 81.

"And," he proceeds, "for my riding abroad sometimes (not far from my charge) in respect of my health only, it hath been well known to your Lordship from the first beginning of my charge, and it is true, I always gave order first for safe keeping of her, with a sure and stronger guard, both within my house and further off, than when myself was with her. I trusted none in my absence but those I had tried, true and faithful servants unto me, and like subjects to her Majesty. I thank God my account of this weighty charge is ready to her Majesty's contentation. No information nor surmise can make me shrink. Nevertheless, henceforth her Majesty's commandment for my continual attendance upon this lady shall be obeyed as her Majesty shall not mislike thereof."[1]

A similar explanation was forwarded to the Queen herself, and, on the 16th December, Burghley had the satisfaction of writing:—

"Her Majesty hath in very good part accepted your last letters to herself, and hath willed me to aserteyn your Lordship that she doth no wise alter her former good opinion of your approved fidelity, and of the care you have of such service as is committed to you, the same being such as none can in her land compare with the trust committed to your Lordship; and yet she would have your Lordship as she saith, not to mislike that when she hath occasion to doubt or fear foreign practices reaching hither into her realm, even to the charge which your Lordship hath, she do warn you thereof; and in so doing not to imagine that she finding such informations to proceed of any mistrust that she hath of your Lordship, no more than she would have if you were her son or brother. This she willeth me to write effectually to your Lordship."[2]

Thus the year closed, a year memorable in the history of Mary Stuart, as it marked the extinction of her last chance of restoration to her crown and kingdom. Elizabeth's dreams of sending her

[1] Shrewsbury to Burghley, Dec. 9, 1572.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 83.

[2] Burghley to Shrewsbury, Dec. 16.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 87.

back to Scotland to reign, were at an end. The Norfolk conspiracy, and its allied outbreak, the Northern Rebellion, had shown the lengths to which Mary was prepared to go; while Elizabeth, in her negotiations with the Regent, proved that her conscientiousness was not greater than that of her rival. Mary's intrigues were fully known in England; her partisans in Scotland, reduced to a handful, were shut up in the Castle of Edinburgh, in the last extremity; and her French relations, busy at home with their own crimes and civil wars, had neither the leisure nor the inclination to render effectual help. Elizabeth at last recognised the necessity of confining, if not killing, the "bird" that had flown to her for shelter, a recognition that ensured cheerless captivity for the Queen of Scots. Matters might perhaps have improved after a time, if she could have contented herself with her needlework, her pet birds, and small dogs. But Mary Stuart's nature was too restless to be quiet, too unscrupulous to be nice in the choice of instruments. It did not fall to her lot to be every day mixed up in great plots, such as the conspiracy with Ridolfi, but if great intrigues failed to present themselves, she devised little ones, ever weaving the meshes around herself; and when fate brought her once again into large treasons, the eagerness with which she embraced the occasion showed that the opportunity, not the disposition, had been wanting.

CHAPTER XI.

AT the beginning of 1573, Shrewsbury's duties as a royal jailer were diversified by the occupation of hunting out and examining conjurers and mass-mongers. He sent one Avery Keller, servant to Rowland Lacon, of Willey, near Bridgenorth, Esquire, to the Privy Council, having extorted from him, after a night's sharp imprisonment, a confession "that he was a dealer with the conjurers, and that he brought certain books of that art unto John Revell, which the conjuring scholars named Palmer and Falconer, and Skinner the priest, did occupy in their practice at the said Revell's house."[1] Their conjuring was for "divers causes;" to discover hid money, for helping a deceased, for knowing some secret place to hide them, and to have certain knowledge also touching the state of this realm."[2]

The simple rustic, Keller, appeared a most dangerous fellow in the eyes of a government surrounded by enemies, and to London he went for further questioning. The diligence of the Earl's commissioners was "very well accepted of my Lords of the

[1] Probably Revell Grange, near Sheffield, the residence for many generations of a Roman Catholic family of that name, now the property of Francis Sutton, Esq., who maintains the services of the old religion in the ancient chapel of the house.

[2] Shrewsbury to Privy Council, Feb. 1.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 89.

Council," and the Queen heard, "not without great contentacion" of his "careful ordering of those matters." [1]

This, however, was but an under current in the great stream. The constant thought of the Earl of Shrewsbury was the safe keeping of the Scottish Queen, whose confinement had now been for many months of the closest character. In a letter to Lord Burghley, dated the 21st February, Shrewsbury relates an interesting conversation he had just had with his charge. Burghley's letters of the 16th of that month had come to hand, together with letters for the Queen of Scots from the French Ambassador, which Shrewsbury delivered. She at once opened and read them in the Earl's presence, and remarked that the Ambassador mentioned a report of her having received 40,000 crowns of the Duke of Norfolk.

"Truly," said she, "I received not so much; nevertheless if the Duke said so, I will not deny it." "Then," says Shrewsbury, "she made a long discourse of the money she spent by the Bishop of Ross, termed her ambassador, and the Bishop of Galloway, with other her commissioners; and gifts also unto her servants, and such like, which, by her long tale, amounted I dare say, to double the aforesaid sum." The Earl told her then plainly that he understood she had received divers sums of money secretly, to be employed for her practices, and if that were true, she had herself to thank "for her wants and lacks, and none others." "Nay," said she, "let them never be afraid (which she repeated divers times), of any money that I will have come into England; for I have given sure order that all

[1] Sir Thomas Smith to Shrewsbury, Feb. 17.—Sir Thos. Smith, knight, one of the Secretaries of State. He was the son of John Smith, of Saffron Walden, by Agnes, daughter of ——— Charnocke of Lancashire. He was twice married, but left no legitimate issue. He died 12th Aug., 1576, aged 65.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 92.

which I can make shall be employed in my service in Scotland, which shall not be defeated for aught they can do." The Earl disclaimed any fear. He only mentioned the matter that she might know who to blame if she did not enjoy everything that she desired. "Unto which she replied not, but entered into her wonted conjectures and suspicions; and said, 'I fear now they go about some exploit in Scotland against me, and therefore would hinder the conveyance of money to mine use out of France; but I have,' said she, 'already taken sure order for their relief; and that the same may be the more large unto them, I will spend on myself here as little as I can.' Shrewsbury tried to find out what she knew of passing events in Scotland, but could not ascertain that she knew 'anything of weight,' but only occupieth herself with suspicions, according to her old custom."

"He strongly objected to a proposal that had been made for Mary to send some of her people into France, or for some from that country to come to her, 'for certainly, whatever she pretends of wants for herself and others, her very meaning and desire is of intelligence, and practices for her purpose, not tolerable.' Nevertheless, if one or other course must be adopted, it would be better to send some of her people into France, and provide her apparel, and receive money, but better than either would be a permission 'to have some money brought from France to serve for her necessaries. In that her Majesty is now more inclined to be suspicious of her doings, I cannot but think her Highness hath great cause so to do, not only remembering that that is past, but also respecting the Cardinal of Lorraine's, . . . with the rest of that house, and herself also principally, with the outrageous and cruel intentions of every of them, well known to be towards her Majesty and the state of this realm, if they had power and liberty to serve to their wills.'"

In a postscript to this letter, Shrewsbury says:—

"As I was about to seal up this letter, she sent for me, and braste out with complaints of her estate; specially how she thinks herself not well used in France by such as she hath put

in trust, touching her living there, saying that the Cardinal, her uncle,[1] that pretends chiefly goodwill to her, doth so dispose her profits and casualties there, at his own liberty, as nothing thereof come to her necessary use; wherefore she desireth that her new officer, whom she hath late put in trust there, may have license to come and declare her estate unto her. . . . Her said new officer is called, as she saith, Mons de Vergé."[2]

From this narrative we get an intimation of what will be more apparent in after years, the shameless robbery of the captive Queen by her French relatives. The Cardinal of Lorraine, with insinuating smoothness, was full of professions, and ready with good advice for his niece, but the hand that wrote in friendliness was purloining the widow's dower; and while advising her "to dissimulate a little time," was himself guilty of that which he recommended. Lodge remarks that "he died in 1574, universally detested, as the chief author of those calamities with which the fiery zeal of his family had afflicted France for several years past."[3]

At this time the busy heads of Mary's friends were at work to secure her deliverance from a captivity that was becoming more and more irksome. On the 1st March, the Earl of Huntingdon, newly appointed President of the Council of the North, received "credyble advertisement" of "some cause of suspicious dealing" for stealing away the Queen of Scots, and he at once apprised the Earl of Shrewsbury by letter, remarking:

"At present I can say no more but that there is in some

[1] Charles of Lorraine, brother to the Duke of Guise, and maternal uncle to Mary.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 95.

[2] Shrewsbury to Burghley, Feb. 21.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 92.

[3] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 95, note.

heads such an intention, and yet at present no great cause to fear hastily the execution of the intent purposed."[1]

On receiving this information, Shrewsbury wrote at once to Elizabeth, dating his letter "at Sheffield Castle, the 3 of March," and saying:—

"It appeareth by my Lord Huntingdon's letters to me, whereof I here send your Majesty copy, that suspicion is of some new device for this Queen's liberty, which I can very easily believe, for I am (as always before) persuaded her friends everywhere occupy their heads thereunto. I look for no less than they can do for her, and provide for her safety accordingly. I have her sure enough, and shall keep her forthcoming at your Majesty's commandment, either quick or dead, whatsoever she, or any for her, invents for the contrary; and as I have no doubt at all of her stealing away from me, so if any forcible attempt be given for her, the greatest peril is sure to be hers. And if I be your Majesty's true faithful servant, as I trust your Majesty is fully persuaded, be your Majesty out of all doubt of any her escape, or delivery from me, by flight, force, or any other ways, without your Majesty's own express and known commandment to me; and whereupon I gage to your Majesty my life, honour, and all. God preserve your Majesty with many happy years, long and prosperously to reign over us."[2]

The inference generally drawn from this letter is that Shrewsbury was prepared to put his captive to death on the first alarm of a rescue, and that he conceived such a resolution would be likely to recommend him to the favour of Elizabeth. The inference seems a fair one, for the letter, read along with that of February 21, and others of this period, shows that Shrewsbury was fully satisfied of the evil intentions of the Queen of Scots.

[1] Huntingdon to Shrewsbury. York, March 1.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 97.

[2] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 96.

Happily for his reputation, however, the resolution, if formed, was never put into execution. Shrewsbury's precautions were always sufficient to prevent surprises; and the particular alarm that called forth his menaces soon subsided. Within a month the Queen of Scots was acknowledging the receipt of four pieces of Holland, sent to her by the French Ambassador, together with three hundred pounds sterling, and was asking for a further supply of money.[1]

We have seen that the Queen of Scots was deprived of her intended visit to Sheffield Manor, in the Autumn of 1572, in consequence of the alarming news from France; but in April, 1573, she enjoyed her first removal from Sheffield Castle, after a confinement there of nearly two years and a half. The imprisonment of Lady Livingstone, her old and beloved friend and attendant, and the news of the siege of Edinburgh Castle, which had been resumed from the beginning of the year, and was now being pushed forward with great vigour by English and Scotch forces, grieved her "more heartily than she would have appear;"[2] and Shrewsbury, with a practical kindness that contrasts rather pleasantly with his theoretical sternness, took the occasion of her trouble to grant her the indulgence of a temporary change of abode.[3] The news of the removal caused some uneasiness at Court. Gilbert Talbot, the Earl's second son, then a young man learning the ways

[1] Mary to La Mothe.—*Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 70.

[2] Shrewsbury to Burghley—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 99.

[3] Shrewsbury to Burghley, April 22.—"Saturday next [25th April] will remove with my charge to my Lodge hereby."

of the world, says in a letter to his father, dated the 11th May:—

"Two days since, Dr. Wilson [who soon afterwards became one of the principal Secretaries of State] told me he heard say that your Lordship with your charge was removed to Sheffield Lodge, and asked me whether it was so or not. I answered, I heard so also, that you were gone thither of force till the Castle could be cleansed. And further he willed to know whether your Lordship did so by the consent of the Council or not. I said I knew not that, but I was certain your Lordship did it upon good ground. I earnestly desired him, of all friendship, to tell me whether he had heard anything to the contrary; which he sware he never did, but asked because he said once that lady should have been conveyed from that house. Then I told him what great heed and care you had to her safe keeping, especially being there, that good numbers of men, continually armed, watched her day and night, and both under her windows, over her chamber, and of every side her; so that, unless she could transform herself to a flea or a mouse, it was impossible that she should escape."[1]

Gilbert Talbot was observant, and quite alive to his father's interests. On his behalf he importuned creditors, and waited on the Lord Treasurer to move him "for the mustering within your Lordship's offices." He noted the movements of the Queen, and of the principal courtiers, and learned, of such young fellows as himself, the gossip of the day. Gilbert's elder brother, Francis Lord Talbot, was at this time also living at Court. In the spring of the preceding year he had been selected by the Queen to accompany the Lord Admiral into France, and from a remark made by his father, in a letter to Lord Burghley, it would seem that he had

[1] Gilbert Talbot to Shrewsbury, May 11.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 101.

previously entangled himself in some discreditable affairs. Shrewsbury says, "My desire has long been that he might be put to some service that her Majesty would like. I beg you will counsel and advise him how he may recover his credit before impaired."[1]

To whatever this may refer, both Lord Talbot and Gilbert were in 1573 in the most dutiful frame of mind. Here are Gilbert's observations to his father, dated "at the Court, this Monday the 25th of May, 1573."

"My Lord, my brother told me of the letter your Lordship sent him for putting away of Morgan and Marven; and said he rejoiced that your Lordship would so plainly direct and command him what to do, and he trusted hereafter to please your Lordship in all his doings; whereunto, according to my duty, I prayed him to have care above all manner of things, and advised him to keep secret your Lordship's directions. I have found out a sober maiden to wait on my wife, if it shall so please your Lordship. She was servant unto Mrs. Southwell, now Lord Padget his wife, who is an evil husband, and will not suffer any that waited of his wife before he married her to continue with her. As it behoves me, I have been very inquisitive of the woman, and have heard very well of her behaviour, and truly I do repose in her to be very modest and well 'gyyen,' and such an one as I trust your Lordship shall not mislike; but if it be so that she shall not be thought meet for my wife, she will willingly repair hither again. Her name is Margaret Butler; she is about 27 years old. Mr. Bateman hath known her long, and thinketh very well of her. She is not very beautiful, but very cleanly in doing of anything, chiefly about a sick body, to dress anything fit for them. I humbly pray your Lordship to send me word whether I shall make shift to send her down presently, for she is very desirous not to spend

[1] Shrewsbury to Burghley, April 22, 1572.—*MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. VIII., No. 38.

her time idly. Thus most humbly desiring your Lordship's daily blessing, with my wonted and continual prayer for your Lordship's preservation in all honour and health, long to continue, I end."[1]

The writer of this letter was not only a married man, as we see, but a member of the House of Commons, representing, along with his brother-in-law, Henry Cavendish, the County of Derby.[2] We enquire not into the genuineness of these submissive and dutiful professions. Sufficient that they are made, and that they contrast very favourably with some of the subsequent proceedings of Gilbert, when, by the death of his brother Francis, he became heir to the Earldom. The two young men, at the time we are now treating of, secured the good word of the Earl of Leicester, who, writing to their father on the 1st June, speaks of "her Majesty's good liking and most gracious using of both your sons, to whom she shows daily as great favours as to any about her; and surely, my Lord, they be such as ye have cause to thank God for, guiding themselves so wisely and orderly, as they win the good opinion of all sorts; whereof for my part, as a branch of your house, I am most glad to see them govern themselves as they do."[3]

Up to this period the Earl of Shrewsbury appears to have found much satisfaction in his marriage with the widow of Sir Wm. St Loe. He addresses her as "my dear none," and concludes:—

"Farewell, my only joy. This Saturday, I pray you keep promise; you said you would be with me in a fortnight at the

[1] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 103. [2] *Parliamentary Return*, p. 408.
[3] Leicester to Shrewsbury, June 1.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 106.

farthest; therefore let me hear from you when I shall send for you your horses, my sweet heart."[1]

Again he says:—

"Of all joys I have under God, the greatest is yourself. To think that I possess so faithful, and one that I know loves me so dear, is all and the greatest comfort that this earth can give. Therefore God give me grace to be thankful to him for his goodness showed unto me a vile sinner. . . . I thank you my sweet heart that you are so willing to come when I will. Therefore, dear heart, send me word how I might send for you; and till I may have your company, I shall think long my only joy; and therefore appoint a day, and in the meantime I shall content me with your will, and long daily for your coming. I your letters con very well, and I like them so well they could not be amended, and have sent them up to Gilbert. I have written to him how happy he is to have such a mother as you are. Farewell, only joy. This Tuesday evening."[2]

This honied language contrasts rather strikingly with some later letters in which the "sweet heart" and "only joy" becomes a "wicked and malicious wife," one whom the Earl "detests," and regards as his "professed enemy," his "mortal enemy." In 1573, however, quarrels were still in the future, and we need not qualify our admiration of an affectionate couple by prematurely contemplating their later "jarres." Their present affectionate mood led to an indulgence for the Queen of Scots, in the form of a removal to the Countess's seat at Chatsworth. But we are anticipating.

Mary's visit to Sheffield Lodge was probably not of long duration, and was certainly unconnected with pleasant memories. On the 29th May, the Castle of Edinburgh fell, and Mary Stuart's flag ceased to

[1] *Gatty's* Hunter, p. 112. [2] *Gatty's* Hunter, p. 112.

float in Scotland. Her party, as an active force, was extinct, and as her hopes of restoration by the aid of Elizabeth had been crushed out in 1572, so in 1573 all prospect of recall by repentant subjects vanished. Every door of hope appeared shut. Deserted by England and France, defeated by her rebels at home, she might have given way to despair; and hopeful and resolute as she was, the news still "nipped her very near." The intelligence of the fall of Edinburgh Castle reached Sheffield by means of letters from Lord Burghley, dated the 4th June, and was promptly communicated to the Queen of Scots by Lord Shrewsbury. Writing to Burghley on the 7th June, Shrewsbury says:—

"I let this Queen understand the state of Edinburgh Castle, wherewith, not well pleased, she said I never brought her any good, but all that might discontent and unquiet her, and willed me to keep the like news to myself from henceforth. I told her she had cause to like the Queen's Majesty's consideration of her son, that with so great charges would seek the recovery of that Castle to his use. A pretty matter, said she, no thanks at all, to help my son to annoy me. I will henceforth, says she, be quiet, and seek by all means to continue my health, and give no more ear to any advertisements from Scotland. This is her determination, so you may believe as please you. She is newly upon this knowledge entered into bane to purge her melancholy, and makes little show of any grief, and yet it nips her very near."[1]

The chief, or rather the only source of Mary Stuart's income, since her flight from Scotland, had been her dowry of £12,000 a-year, as widow of Francis II., King of France. So handsome a sum, equivalent to an income in modern times of

[1] Shrewsbury to Burghley, June 7.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IX., No. 5.

nearly ten times as much, would have enabled her to maintain royal state at her own cost, but she preferred to devote as much as possible to the support of her cause in Scotland. With the proceeds of the dowry her forces were paid and armed, and her partizans encouraged; but now that her adherents were scattered, and her chief supporters dead,[1] there seemed to be no reason why her fortune should not be applied to her own personal use. The captive, and almost friendless Queen, found many ready to plunder, but few willing to guard her interests. Her French relatives displayed no scruples in dealing with the Dowager's income. She had ceased to be of use to them politically, and French statesmen placed utility before honesty. She was regarded in the light of an inconveniently long-lived annuitant, and the authors of the massacre of St Bartholomew were not the people to hesitate to rob a widow, if such a course suited their convenience. Elizabeth too, but from different motives, indicated a willingness to trench upon the income of her captive. From the time of Mary's being placed under the care of the Earl of Shrewsbury, an allowance of £52 a-week had been made from the Exchequer for her maintenance. But this allowance Shrewsbury found quite inadequate to defray the charges to which he was put, not only in finding provisions for so large a household, but in paying soldiers and servants to guard the prisoner. A way

[1] Maitland died suddenly in prison, shortly after the surrender of Edinburgh Castle, "of his natural sickness," as Lord Burghley says; and Kirkcaldy of Grange, with his brother and two goldsmiths, were executed by the Regent Morton on the 3rd August.

of evading the obligation of maintaining her prisoner appears to have occurred to the economical mind of Elizabeth. Perhaps the fall of Edinburgh Castle may have suggested the idea that Mary would not know what to do with her money, or possibly the news of the treatment the Queen of Scots was receiving at the hands of her French relatives may have prompted Elizabeth to assist in the work of plunder. At all events, she proposed that Mary should defray her own charges, and Shrewsbury was instructed to sound her on the subject. Writing on the 15th July, to Sir Francis Walsingham, who had returned in May from the French Embassy, and been appointed one of the Secretaries of State, Shrewsbury says:—

"And where you wrote to me that the Queen's Majesty willed I should treat with this Queen to defray her own charges with her dowry of France, having by her own occasion good opportunity, I moved her as I might conveniently thereto; and as she seemed not to mislike thereof at all, but rather desirous to bear her own charges, so she asked me in what sort and with what manner of liberty she should be permitted to the same; and when I answered that had not been yet so far thought of, she would needs write to know the manner of it, and in what sort it was meant to her. Assure yourself if the liberty and manner thereof content her as well as the motion, she will easily assent to it; and so I wish it, as may be without peril other ways; and for the charges in safe keeping her, I have found them greater many ways than some have accounted of, and than I have made show of or grieved at, for in service of her Majesty I can think my whole patrimonies well bestowed."[1]

Mary's meaning was sufficiently clear. If she might have liberty, or even a modified restraint,

[1] Shrewsbury to Walsingham, July 15.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 109.

she would be ready to bear her own charges; but so long as Elizabeth deemed it necessary to keep her in captivity, she was resolved not to free the Queen of England from the usual obligation of maintaining her prisoners. Elizabeth deemed it of more importance to confine the Queen of Scots than to save £2700 a-year, and so the negotiation fell to the ground.

The French proceedings in relation to the dowry, were of another kind. Part of Mary's income was derived from lands in the Duchy of Touraine, and it suited the purpose of some French prince to propose an exchange of estates. M. du Verger, Mary's chancellor, and M. Vassal, maitre d'hotel to the French Ambassador in London, were sent to Sheffield to explain the proposed transaction. They arrived on the 9th June, and remained till the end of July. Shrewsbury was at first very suspicious. Though they bore letters from the Lord Treasurer authorising them to repair to the Queen of Scots, "for conference on matters of account," Shrewsbury felt sure they would invent all ways they might for her liberty, and watched them with a jealous eye. His suspicions, however, were gradually removed, and instead of treating the Queen with increased rigour, he became more indulgent than usual. Mary herself admits that she was well treated during this time, and had free permission to confer with the two envoys, but she suspected the motives of such unwonted generosity, ascribing it to a desire to close her mouth as to complaints of past ill usage.[1]

[1] Mary to La Mothe.—*Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 76.

The conferences were many, not only on the subject of the dowry, but on other points, and when the envoys finally left Sheffield, on the 31st July, Mary entrusted to them a budget of letters, both to her friends in France, to the French Ambassador, and to Queen Elizabeth. The restriction that had been so long placed upon her correspondence was relaxed. Mary's pen once more poured forth its voluminous complaints, and for the remainder of the year her letters are numerous, if not very interesting.

The question of the health of the Queen of Scots was one frequently under discussion. She had, without success, asked permission in April, 1572, to visit the famous baths at Buxton, whose nature-heated waters had been noted from the time of the Romans for their curative powers in rheumatic complaints. Now, in the summer of 1573, the request was again pressed upon the notice of Elizabeth, both by Mary herself and by the French Ambassador. Shrewsbury appears to have disliked the responsibility involved in the change, for he was ever suspicious of practices. Mary's request was naturally referred to him for his opinion as to the "convenience and meetness thereof, and what need she hath of that bath; and if her journey thither be needful and fit, then how it may be done conveniently." To these enquiries Shrewsbury replied:

"I can say little of the state of her body. She seems more healthful now, and all the last year past, than before. She hath very much used bathing with herbs now of late, as she hath done other years. What need she hath of Buxton well, I know not, further than I have here writ. My Lord Treasurer

knoweth Buxton and the country thereabout; therefore I refer the fitness of her journey thither to his Lordship's consideration, and my Lords and others of the Council, as shall please the Queen's Majesty to direct. I shall carry and keep her safely here and there alike." [1]

Thus Shrewsbury sought to evade the responsibility of advising the removal; but he was equally afraid of being thought to hinder it. In a letter to Walsingham, dated 15th July, he says:—

"Since I last wrote you my opinion of this Queen's health, and something of her journey to Buxton well, she hath charged me (and the French here affirmed for true) that her going thither is referred to me, and I am thereby hinderer of her health by stopping her from thence. She complains more of her hardness in her side than of late. I look in such matters of her more liberty to be directed, and therefore pray you for my discharge, procure her Majesty's resolution thereof may be signified hither. My care for her safety shall be here and there alike." [2]

Resolution on the part of Elizabeth was a thing very difficult to secure. She preferred to throw responsibility on others, leaving herself free to take up any position that circumstances might render desirable. While the question of a visit to Buxton was being passed from the Queen to Shrewsbury, from Shrewsbury to the Lord Treasurer and the Council, and from the Council to the Queen again, a modified resolution was come to, to remove Mary to her old quarters at Chatsworth. The change, though but a small one, might do her good, and if Buxton were finally resolved on, Chatsworth was on the way thither. The journey seems to have

[1] Shrewsbury to Walsingham.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 109.
[2] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 110.

been performed between Friday, the 31st July, and Monday, the 3rd August, for on the first of those days the Queen of Scots wrote a letter from Sheffield, to her kinsman, the Duke de Nevers, and on the latter she wrote from Chatsworth to M. la Mothe. The change of residence would therefore in all likelihood be made on Saturday, the 1st August. A few days afterwards, Elizabeth brought herself reluctantly to consent to the proposed journey to Buxton, and Lord Burghley conveyed the intelligence to Shrewsbury, saying:—

"I . . . am now commanded to write to your Lordship by her Majesty that she is pleased that if your Lordship shall think you may without peril conduct the Queen of Scots to the well of Buxton, according to her most earnest desire, your Lordship shall so do; using such care and respect for her person to continue in your charge, as hitherto your Lordship hath honourably, happily, and serviceably done: And when your Lordship shall determine to remove with the said Queen thither, it were good that as little foreknowledge abroad as may conveniently be given; and nevertheless, that for the time that she shall be there, that all others, being strangers from your Lordship's company, be forbidden to come thither during the time of the said Queen's abode there. And this I write because her Majesty was very unwilling that she should go thither, imagining that her desire was either to be the more seen of strangers resorting thither, or for the achieving of some further enterprise to escape; but on the other part, I told her Majesty that if in very deed her sickness were to be relieved thereby, her Majesty could not in honour deny her to have the natural remedy thereof; and for her safety, I knew your Lordship would have sufficient care and regard; and so her Majesty commanded me to write to your Lordship that you might conduct her thither, and also to have good respect to her: and according to this her Majesty's determination, the French Ambassador, being with her at

Eridg, my Lord of Burgeni's house in Waterdore forest in Sussex, hath received knowledge from her Majesty that you shall thus do."[1]

Scarcely had the consent been given than Elizabeth's heart misgave her. The newly elected King of Poland, brother of the King of France, was applying for a safe conduct for himself, his ships, and 4000 men, in case he should be driven by stress of weather into English ports, while on the way to take possession of his kingdom; and this circumstance, occurring simultaneously with the Queen of Scots' pressing entreaties to be allowed to go to Buxton, suggested to Elizabeth the idea of a connection between the two events. "But thanked be God," says Burghley, "your Lordship is far enough from any ports with your charge, and yet, as the time occasioneth, your Lordship may be the more circumspect with secresy, and without note to her or hers." Reflection, however, only made Elizabeth more uneasy. By the 18th August, her anxieties could be no longer restrained, and she wrote in her own name to Shrewsbury for the purpose of once more hedging away from the responsibility which in Burghley's letter she had appeared with hesitation to assume. Elizabeth says:—

"By your letters, we perceive your determination to take the Queen of Scots to Buxton wells about the end of the week, as you were told by Burghley's letters we should be content if you thought it might be done without peril. We commanded Burghley to write thus, on the earnest pressing of the French Ambassador, and we well allow of your consideration in providing a convenient number of horse and foot as a guard during her removing and abode there. Nevertheless, within these two

[1] Burghley to Shrewsbury, Aug. 10.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 111.

or three days we hear from sundry places that there is some practice in hand to put her to liberty. There is a suspicion from the late long abode of the president [M. du Verger] with her, that now upon his return, and her removing, some attempt will be made. If we had not already yielded, or you had not opened the matter to her, 'we could have been well content that she had now [? not] gone to the Buxtons at this time;' but as it can not well be altered, we wish you to be more watchful, and have your company increased, that no resort of strangers should be suffered to come near her, that she be not suffered to trifle out her time there, but be advised to apply the use of the wells as the physician may direct, and not to tarry above or days, or rather if possible fewer. Some of the French Ambassador's ministers, who were there with the president, report that she is in a house of less strength than before, and at more liberty. How truly, we leave to you, knowing that being made acquainted therewith, you will the more circumspectly look to your charge. We commend your care. The Queen of Scots is not to know of this."[1]

At length the knotty point was settled. Elizabeth admitted the arrangement could not decently be altered, and Shrewsbury effected the removal with all the circumspection in his power. The Queen of Scots left Chatsworth about the 21st or 22nd of August, and she was back there again on the 27th September; so that at the utmost her stay at Buxton did not exceed five weeks.

The hot springs at Buxton were known to and used by the Romans, but in the middle ages the baths fell into neglect. The well belonged to the Talbot family as early as the 39th Henry VI. (1460), but it was not until the 16th century that the waters came into great repute. Early in the reign of

[1] *Draft by Burghley, p.* 2. *Endd.* "18 Aug. 1573. M. to the Erle of Shr."—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IX., No. 6. The number of days is left blank in the draft.

Queen Elizabeth, George, sixth Earl of Shrewsbury, erected a house there for the use of bathers, and in 1572, Dr. Jones, a famous physician, published a treatise extolling the virtues of Buxton waters. In his book, Dr. Jones thus describes the Earl of Shrewsbury's house:—

"Joining to the chief spring, between the river and the bath, is a very goodly house, four square, four stories high, so well compact with houses of office beneath, and above and round about, with a great chamber and other goodly lodgings to the number of thirty, that it is and will be a beauty to behold, and very notable for the honourable and worshipful that shall need to repair thither, as also for others. Yea, the poorest shall have lodgings and beds hard by for their uses only. The baths also so beautified with seats round about, defended from the ambient air, and chimneys for fire to air your garments in the bath's side, and other necessaries most decent. And truly, I suppose, that if there were for the sick a sanctuary during their abode there, for all causes saving sacrilege, treason, murder, burglary, rape, and robbing by the highway side, with also a licence for the sick to eat flesh at all times, and a Friday market weekly, and two fairs yearly, it should be to the posterities, not only commodious, but also to the Prince, great honour and gain."

To the gentlemen attending these baths, Dr. Jones recommends as exercise, bowling, shooting at butts, and tossing the wind ball.

"The ladies, gentlewomen, wives, and maids may have in the end of a bench eleven holes made, into the which to trowle pummetes or bowls of lead, big, little, or mean, or also of tin, copper, wood, either violent or soft, after their own discretion; the pastime Troule in Madame, is termed. Likewise, men feeble, the same may also practise in another gallery of the new buildings."[1]

Such was Buxton, and such were its amusements,

[1] *Lyson's* Derbyshire, p. 34.

when Mary Queen of Scots was introduced there; but of what she did, and how she passed her time, little is recorded.

All strangers, as we have seen, were warned away, and Shrewsbury carried out Elizabeth's suggestion, insisting upon the Queen of Scots making the best use of the opportunity, for Mary herself assures us that he was always punctilious in obeying his orders.[1] In bathing and in exercise the time was spent, and if we may believe Buxton tradition, Mary also found opportunity for exploring some of the romantic beauties of the neighbourhood. In Poole's hole, a remarkable series of lime-stone caverns, situated a short distance from the town, a pillar of stalactite, called the Queen of Scots' pillar, is pointed out as the extreme point to which she penetrated on a visit to that place, but as to the truth of the story history is silent. The pen of the Queen of Scots appears not to have been idle, but the fruits of its labours have not descended to posterity. In her letter to the French Ambassador, dated Chatsworth, 27th September, she acknowledges the receipt of his letters of the 25th August, which were conveyed to her on the 21st of September, but she also speaks of having written to him several times, though she knows not whether he has received the communications, or whether they have been as long in reaching him, as his have been in finding her. Be this as it may, she instructs him to thank Elizabeth

[1] "I have never doubted that my lord of Shrewsbury is a wise lord, and that he knows well what he has to do. I am well aware that he will always execute his orders with the utmost exactitude."—Mary to La Mothe, Nov. 30, 1573.—*Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 92.

again, even if he has done so already, for granting the permission to visit Buxton, and to say to her—

"That as to the point in which she is pleased to fear that I have found the contrary to that which I hoped for, I have not been at all disappointed, thank God, having found some relief; and I did not perceive that the new building can in any degree have diminished the natural warmth of the water, for if the season had been more suitable, the sun, as it seems to me, would have been able to shine upon it without hindrance; and if in the coming year, it should please her, at a better season, to grant me the same permission, and to give me rather a longer time, I believe that will quite cure me, if no other accident should happen."

On the subject of her present treatment, Mary was also solicitous. M. du Verger had heard, she says:

"From the Lord Treasurer, that the intention of the Queen, my good sister, is that my Lord of Shrewsbury should permit me to take recreation, on foot and on horseback, when I wish, and that she believes this is not refused me. On this point I wish to inform you, M. de la Mothe Fénélon, that I have no more liberty than I had before the visit of du Verger, and that I am in the same condition; and that as for anything which is referred to my Lord of Shrewsbury, if he has not express commandment it is so much mockery. When, therefore, anything is granted to you in my behalf, if you do not see letters of the Queen, or of the Lord Treasurer to that effect, I pray you to pay no regard to it, and to rest assured that Lord Shrewsbury will do nothing for anything I show him of what you may write to me. I have few servants; and it is not possible that they will be able to hold out much longer. I have only one gentleman in waiting, and if he is ill, I am obliged to wait upon myself. I pray you take steps to get some sent to me, and to remember the passports for Rollett, and my wants."

In a postscript Mary adds:—

"I pray you let me hear your answer shortly, and send me the mithridate of which I have written to you, the best that

can be made, and in the most secure manner you can, and the rest of the necessaries which I have asked M. de Vassal to buy for me, especially the white silk, because that is what I am in the most haste for; as to the green, I have enough."[1]

These complaints Mary was pleased to describe as trifles. She would not trouble Lord Burghley with "so small a matter," an inadvertent confession that her complaints were exaggerated, and would not bear investigation. During the stay at Chatsworth, Shrewsbury was "troubled a little with pain," but he would "not term it gout;" and on the first of November he was able to say, "Thank God, I am well again, and mind within three or four days [to go] to Sheffield with my charge." He was, however, sufficiently alert to his duty to entertain his chronic fear of "practices," and was delighted to hear that the Queen had refused permission for one Archie Leten to visit the Queen of Scots, "for . . . none fit person he is to come to her unless it were to [put] some practice in execution for her, which surely . . . the fitest man I know longing to her for [that purpose]."[2]

Shrewsbury's letter was written on Sunday, and before that week expired he had safely lodged his charge in Sheffield Castle, from which she had been absent three months. On the 8th of the same month Mary wrote to La Mothe, urging him among other things to hasten her secretary, and not forget Rollett. He was to make, if he pleased, her compliments to the Lord Treasurer and the Earl of Leicester, "without forgetting Mester Walsingham."[3]

[1] *Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 82.

[2] Shrewsbury to Sir Thos. Smith, Nov. 1.—*Dom. Eliz. Addenda*, v. 23, p. 32.

[3] *Labanoff*, v, 4, p. 86.

During the month of November, Leslie, a servant of the Bishop of Ross, who was still in confinement, came down to Sheffield with letters for the Queen, and bearing also a communication from Burghley to Shrewsbury. The Earl was instructed to peruse the letters and writings before allowing them to be delivered; and on doing so, he found them to consist, besides letters, of—

"A book or register of the Bishop of Ross' service and travels in her cause, a copy of an oration exhibited late unto the Queen's Majesty, as he sayeth, and an instrument to be signed and sealed by this Queen, expressing as well her acceptation of his said service, as also his discharge now of the same, which she hath performed according to his request." [1]

The Bishop was soon afterwards released from an imprisonment, which had extended over nearly two years, and retired into France. He died at Brussels in 1596.

The plots, which in August had called forth from Burghley a thankful ejaculation that Shrewsbury and his charge were far away from any port, had not been abandoned when the year closed. Mary's partizans in Lancashire were still devising how they might carry her to Houghton Tower or Hornby Castle, whence they hoped to be able to convey her to some port on the coast, from which she could sail to France, Spain, or Scotland;[2] and Elizabeth was rewarding the care of Lord Shrewsbury, who prevented the success of these schemes, by entertaining doubts of his fidelity.[3]

[1] Shrewsbury to Burghley, Nov. 30, 1573.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 114.

[2] Hayworth to Leicester.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IX., No. 10.

[3] *Murdin*, 272, 3.

CHAPTER XII.

THE events of 1574, numerous and interesting as they are, group themselves around three or four leading events. There were practisings as usual, and dissimulation, harsh suspicions of Shrewsbury, and all the machinery of intrigue that seemed inseparably to associate itself with the Queen of Scots. Mary opened the year by a letter of fair professions to her sister of England,[1] the value of which we may estimate by observing that, according to the advice of her saintly uncle, the Cardinal of Lorraine, she was to be patient, and to dissimulate a little time,[2] until effectual aid could be given to her. Huntingdon was on the look-out for practices at York, while Shrewsbury, though troubled with an extreme cough and fever which much weakened him, was no less careful than ever of his charge. He took such order with his wife and trusty servants, that whatever became of him, the Queen of Scots would have been safe forthcoming; and if any extremity happened, Shrewsbury intended to send for Sir Thomas Gargrave.[3] Among them, the guardians of the Queen felt the ground so well covered, that it

[1] *Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 101.

[2] Cardinal of Lorraine to the Queen of Scots.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IX., No. 11.

[3] Shrewsbury to Burghley.—*Talbot MSS.*, P. 673. *Holograph.*

was not rash to say, "let the devil and his instruments do their worst," at least the prisoner was safe.[1]

But the ministers of the devil were not all acting on behalf of the Queen of Scots. As there were practices on her part, so there were practices against her. If she was clever at intrigue, the ministers of Elizabeth were not less so. If she worked by conspiracies, they conspired to defeat her. As an example of intrigue on the side of Elizabeth, take the correspondence between one William Wharton, and certain lords and gentlemen high in the service and confidence of the Virgin Queen. Intelligence was sorely wanted about the doings of the lady at Sheffield. In spite of every precaution and every severity, letters still reached her hands, and replies found their way both to Mary's partizans in Scotland, and to her relatives and friends in France. Many devices had been tried to stop this interchange of intelligence without success. Shrewsbury had exerted all his ingenuity to detect the practisers; and the wardens of the Scotch marches had watched narrowly the travellers passing through their jurisdiction, but still intelligence was conveyed. The case was perplexing, but the mystery must be solved; and in those days, the end was held to justify the means. Lord Burghley was not particular in the employment of instruments, so long as their operations conduced to the stability of Queen Elizabeth's throne, and as he was meditating at the close of 1573, on the doings of the Queen of Scots, a suitable tool with which to counterwork

[1] Huntingdon to Shrewsbury.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 115.

them was offered to his hand. One William Wharton wrote to the Lord Treasurer from Ripon, on the 9th December, bemoaning the existence of a remnant, "vehemently suspected to be favourers of that seditious company who bear such sway, that divers good members and well-willers are 'pessumdidate,' and clear out of countenance in these parts."

Under circumstances so discouraging, Wharton's advice was to place some trusty and dear friends in Yorkshire, by whom "our crooked natures may be aptly bridled," and "lurking traitors brought to light, and their privy supporters weeded out."

Delicately enough the writer offers his own services in the capacity indicated, throwing in a pathetic allusion to his "poor wife and children," whom he must either take to another country, or keep where they are, "with continual fear of bodily harm." With a little pardonable exaggeration he described himself as a suffering patriot, seeking such comfort as was to be derived from the line of Horace, which says,—

"Dulce et decorum est pro patriâ mori."

"If," he says, "my ability were such as it was before that crafty traitor Richard Norton brought me to extreme poverty, I would not have made this letter a spokesman to your honour in this behalf."

On the 17th December, writing from his "poor house at Ryppon," to the Earl of Huntingdon, Lord President of the North parts, Wharton encloses a copy of his letter to Lord Burghley, and begs the Earl to be his good lord, in consideration of his

faithful service to the Queen, so that his adversaries may be afraid of attempting any unlawful act against him.

"I know," he continues, "that my doings shall be touched with obloquy, and as poverty never lacks enmity, so shall my poor and rugged fortune be a fit instrument that my base estate can never stand free from the malicious lips of detraction, against the poisoned sting whereof I have not any other remedy comfortative than in your Lordship's accustomed good nature and discretion. Let not the trespasses of my youth be a mean to defame me and my doings, but rather suspend your judgment till I can answer myself."

Here then was an instrument likely to be useful and ready to hand. Wharton was encouraged to go to London, and after various interviews with members of the Privy Council, he returned to Yorkshire at the beginning of March, with letters of credence from the Earl of Bedford to the Earl of Huntingdon, and from Walsingham to Sir John Foster, warden of the Middle Marches. Huntingdon was merely asked to "stand his good lord," and suspend his judgment. Sir John Foster was requested, in the name of the Queen, "to give him credit and countenance, and also assistance upon his instructions for the better bringing to light of the Queen of Scots' devices and practices here and elsewhere."

In consequence of these instructions, Foster wrote to Huntingdon on the 24th March, intimating that Wharton's service required secret friendship. He also wrote to the Earl of Bedford, saying:—

"I have conceived a good opinion of his doings, and have concluded with him for an order and direction for the better

advancement of his intended good service. . . . His service requires secret friendship, convenient time, and privy supporttation for the more speedy expedition thereof. I have found him an apt instrument for this purpose, and very careful to seek by all possible means the advancement of the Queen's causes."

The order and device agreed upon between Sir John Foster and Wharton, was not a very creditable one; but it was such an one as was then not uncommon. At that time Sir Thomas Carre, laird of Fernihurst, a notorious border chief, was lodged with Sir John Foster, in exile from the displeasure of the Regent of Scotland, who had confiscated his goods, and sought his life. Carre made suit to Sir John Foster for licence to depart into France, but permission was refused, because he also solicited leave to write to the Scottish Queen. This circumstance suggested to the fertile brains of Walsingham and his instruments a plan for drawing intelligence from Sheffield. It was proposed that Carre should be allowed to write to the Queen of Scots, "declaring nothing but only for her favour, and as may be thought good by the Lord Warden; then the practice is to have one instructed by the Lord Warden, to convey the letter to the Scotch Queen, and deal politicly therein, according to instructions given him," and so, under guise of being a friend of Carre's, to extract from Mary some intelligence that might be turned against her. "This," adds Wharton, in a communication to the Earl of Huntingdon, made in his garden, within the Manor of York, 27th March, 16th Elizabeth, "this cannot well succeed unless the Earl of Shrewsbury be made privy thereto."

But supposing Carre could not be drawn into this device, and refused to be the means of deceiving his Royal Mistress, by whom he was dearly beloved, the statesmen of Elizabeth had yet another resource. A letter was to be sent from the Privy Council to the Lord Warden, ordering him to see to the straight keeping of Carre, and not to allow him to have the least conference with any one. Instructions such as these were expected to frighten him into compliance and force him to become a practiser, as the traitors and plotters of that day were called.

But there were still other resources in the minds of those that served in the Elizabethan intelligence department. Here is one of them:—

"Item, if these devices fail, then resteth it that the Queen of Scots' hand, the Lord Harris, and the Lord of Loughenbarre's hands, and other her secret favourer's hands in Scotland and elsewhere should be counterfeit, and be set to such devised letters as shall be thought most meet for this purpose; and a messenger fit and meet for the same travaille to be appointed by the Lord Warden for the conveying thereof. And when he hath by policy, according to his instructions, won credit, and received the letters at the Scotch Queen's hands, then he should be apprehended at some prescribed place upon secret intelligence thereof."

This is a suggestive "item," indeed. Can we wonder that there should have been so much controversy about the various episodes of the Scotch Queen's history, when we find how deliberately forgery and fraud were planned? The turning points of the Marian controversy are the genuineness, or otherwise, of certain famous letters. The prearranged arrest of convenient tools had been tried

in Scotland by Murray and his friends; and the English, in their dire perplexity, seem to have thought of borrowing a leaf out of Murray's book. If the Scotch could forge whole letters, surely English ingenuity might counterfeit signatures, and so arrive at the discovery of practices that threatened the safety of the realm. The times were desperate, and truly the measures resorted to for the protection of the Protestant faith and the liberties of England were desperate too.

Wharton carried these suggestions to the Earl of Huntingdon, by credit from the Lord Warden, and having written them out, signed his name. The designs were framed, however, in a longer head than either Foster's or Wharton's. None other than that genius of intrigue, Walsingham himself, had laid this train, and, through Wharton, communicated it to Sir John Foster. His service about the Queen of Scots, Wharton hoped to bring to good effect, but he also recommended that diligent search should be made on the coast, that no crays or other vessels should come in at Workington, Elve foot, or other creeks, and that all vessels be rifled for letters of the Lord of Loughenbarre, and the other friends of the Scotch Queen in Galloway; for it was thought she received intelligence that way.

The worthy project miscarried, as it deserved. Carre was perhaps too shrewd to be made a tool of, or the messenger failed to deal "politicly," according to his instructions; or Lord Shrewsbury was awkward, or the forgers were unskilful. At all events, nothing came of the plots so carefully laid

in the spring; but Wharton, still anxious to prove his merit, and blot out the memory of events which he refers to more than once as the "trespasses of his youth," continued busy far into the summer, devising new schemes. In June, he had arrived at the resolution to go himself to Sheffield, and try what his abilities and personal supervision could do to win credit, and bring to light the devices of the Queen of Scots. To this end he desired Huntingdon to write to Shrewsbury, explaining the cause of his appearance in Sheffield, and instructing the Earl to apprehend and commit Wharton to prison; the device being that, after a short detention, the spy should be brought up for examination as a suspected person, and in the end be allowed the liberty of the house, with a keeper, "and so by overlooking, and his cunning handling of the practice to make his attempt." Such treachery had succeeded before, and might again. The pretended imprisonment was calculated to win the confidence of the captive, and such "cunning handling" as rogues of the Wharton class knew how to practise, might lead one eager for communication to fall into the trap. Whether it did in this instance or not, Wharton does not tell us. In December, twelve months after his first introduction to the dirty business, we find him writing to Sir Thomas Gargrave, a prominent Yorkshire worthy of those days, to excuse his non-appearance in answer to a suit instituted against him, probably by some of his creditors. He pleads the importance of his promised service, as an excuse for his absence, and says, "At that very time I was

with a secret friend, and set down with him such an order (under pretended friendship for the Scotch Queen), that I will perform my promised service, or else let me be punished. . . . Zopirus never more cunningly entered into league with the Babylonians by feigned friendship than I have already practised in this matter."

The service was still in the future, always going to bear fruit, but never doing so. Wharton was a man of promises, and also a man of patience, but when March, 1575, had arrived, and he seemed still no nearer redeeming his pledges, even his buoyant and hopeful nature grew despairing. He was angry, and full of excuses.

"I am continually," he says, "pestered with undeserved obloquy, the frailty of my past years being set forth by my adversaries, my faithful service misconstrued, my travail and bodily peril and great expenses disregarded; my adversaries (Thos. Wray and his rebellious society) overshadowed by procured friendship and lucrificious favourers; and your lordship wrested to mislike me and my doings."

Still he refused to despair. Unalloyed treachery having so far failed, Wharton's next plan was to mix himself up with some genuine messenger from the friends of the Queen of Scots, so that he might gain, through a subordinate, that which he had failed to obtain by direct dealings with the mistress. Could such opportunities be afforded him he would succeed; but if he failed, he says, "Let my Sovereign take from me the greatest jewel that man possesseth, which is the only thing that my adversaries daily gape for."

Unluckily for himself, Wharton's great services

were always performed in the future tense. When he wrote thus to the Earl of Huntingdon, his creditors, through base consideration for penny pieces, were striving to cast him into prison. Perhaps they succeeded. At all events William Wharton sank out of sight, thrown aside like a discarded tool, useless even in a disgraceful service, and leaving behind him only the records of infamy, and a curious picture of the times in which he lived.[1]

The difficulties arising out of the irregular payment of the Queen of Scots' dowry, caused her at this time much perplexity and trouble. In February, she wrote to Lord Burghley, earnestly entreating permission to provide for her affairs. There was an action at law pending, which she felt sure must suffer for want of communication with her; and even if Elizabeth did not mind her loss in that respect, as well as in others, at least she entreated her to consider the necessities of her poor servants, both in England and France, who would be all destitute if she could not obtain the means to pay them. Elizabeth must either provide for her and her people, or permit her to obtain means from France.[2]

[1] *Cotton MSS. Caligula*, c. III., 439-449. In a letter dated from York, in 1582, we find a later reference to William Wharton. It has not been published, and occurs among the original manuscripts preserved at the seat of the Marquis of Bath, Longleat, Wilts.

"Martin Birkhead to the Earl of Shrewsbury.

"York, 22 June, 1582.

"I received a letter from my Lord President to Mr. Wortley and myself, to agree Mr. George Savile and the parson of Thorn-le if we can. We hope that my Lord President would be here at the next sitting. A preacher hath written to me that one William Wharton, an old man (whom I think your Lordship knoweth), being requested by a great number of gentlemen to sit at the table end with them, for that he could keep them good talk, he answered and said, 'I shall then tell you lies, as the preachers do in the pulpit.' I have showed the Council hereof, that he may be punished according to his deserts, if it be proved against him."—[*Original at Longleat, Red 4to. N.S.*]

[2] Mary to Burghley.—*Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 104.

The illness of Mary's French Secretary, Rollett, added to her difficulties, for in his absence she had no one able to conduct her foreign correspondence, or attend to her finances, and he, poor fellow, was rapidly passing into the last stages of consumption. In February, he was unable to write; in March, he was "extremely ill;" in May, he continued so prostrate that the Queen was still writing her own letters, and managing her own affairs.

In matters of millinery Mary was more clever than in finance, and the French Ambassador not unfrequently received such commissions as these:—

"I must give you the trouble of acting for me in smaller matters, viz., to send me as soon as you can, eight ells of crimson satin, of the colour of the sample of silk which I send you, the best that you can find in London; but I should like to have it in fifteen days, and one pound of the thinner and double silver thread, which you will be able to get woven [*que pourrés faire tramer*] and soon I will give you an account of the work in which I think of employing it."[1]

The Queen of Scots was at this time anxious to obtain permission for an old French attendant, Madlle. Rallay, to come to her, and both her own letters, and those of the King of France, impress upon La Mothe the desirability of obtaining a passport for this woman. The Ambassador mentioned the subject to Lord Burghley in the middle of February, and was advised not to press it, but to content

[1] Mary to La Mothe, Feb. 20.—*Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 111.—The Earl of Wharncliffe possesses two beautiful fire screens, which are said to have been worked by the Queen of Scots and her ladies, during her captivity in Sheffield. They represent landscapes, enlivened by mythological figures, and enclosed within borders of the cinque cento style. The design is free from the stiffness so often characteristic of needlework, and the colours retain their brightness in a remarkable degree. The blue is slightly faded, but the gold thread is untarnished. The screens are at present mounted on modern stands, and occupy a place in the drawing-room at Wortley Hall.

himself for the present with knowing that the Queen of Scots was well in health and well treated, and that the Queen of England was less irritated against her, and against the Earl of Shrewsbury, than she used to be.[1] Taking advantage of this favourable aspect of affairs, Mary intimated to M. La Mothe that her only anxiety was to get quietly out of this kingdom; and the same day she renewed her supplications for favour to Elizabeth, and complained of the malice of her enemies. She had been charged, she said, with bribing English subjects with money. That was only a supposition, and indeed, she could not get more money than was necessary to pay her servants, and provide for her wants. The responsibility of all that happened to her she threw on Elizabeth, and should never attribute to any other the good or evil that befel her in this country. "Madam," she added, "I beseech you, in future, to believe nothing concerning me, but what you have sufficient proof of; . . . and permit me to have access to you, that I may relate to you my griefs."[2]

Elizabeth had no intention of permitting anything of the kind, but it pleased her to amuse the French King with the idea that her heart was melting towards her cousin. La Mothe reports to his Royal Master, in a letter dated the 24th March, that the Lord Treasurer had himself selected the most fitting time for presenting Mary's letter to his Mistress, and informed him that the whole of it was read to

[1] *Teulet's* La Mothe, v. 6, p. 34.

[2] Mary to Elizabeth, Feb. 20.—*Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 112.

the Queen, who found it expressed in terms so becoming, and so well written, that Burghley assured him it had done much to regain the heart of his Mistress; and that matters at present got on pretty well, and he hoped they would go still better between these two.[1]

No direct answer, however, was sent to the Queen of Scots, and in April, M. La Mothe pressed for a reply, having heard from Mary that she was no better for the fair professions that had been made to him, and that her only exercise was to read and work in her chamber, to assist which she wanted four ounces more of the crimson silk, same as she had some time ago, and eight ells of crimson taffeta for lining.[2] Writing to the King of France, La Mothe says:—

"I have entreated the Queen of England as humbly as possible to give an answer to certain letters written to her by the Queen of Scots, and I have sounded her very gently to ascertain how she is at present disposed towards her. She answered me in a very gracious manner, that she would write to her, or at least to the Earl of Shrewsbury, all that she had to answer, and that she wished me to write to her freely that she had not at present any other new offence against her, except the recollection of those that were already passed; and she had commanded the boxes, packages, and letters that had lately arrived for her from France to be forwarded to her."[3]

In reporting the arrival of these articles at Sheffield, and their delivery to the Queen of Scots, Shrewsbury half remonstrates against the indulgence so allowed, remarking "Her Majesty may be sure she will not lack intelligence while she suffers mes-

[1] *Teulet's* La Mothe, v. 6, p. 64. [2] *Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 119.
[3] *Teulet's* La Mothe, v. 6, p. 76.

sengers and letters to come to her. I can not be more wary to cut her from all intelligence and practice, and will continue so."[1]

The early part of this year was an uneasy time for the Earl of Shrewsbury. His chaplain, one Thomas Corker, who enjoyed the vicarage of Rotherham, and the rectory of Handsworth, by the bounty of his Lordship, went up to London, along with another clergyman named Howarth, and communicated with Dr. Wilson, Master of Requests, charging the Earl with favouring the title of the Queen of Scots, and with other crimes, and also representing him as a credulous fool, who was the sport of more clever and designing people. Corker was examined by the Earl of Leicester, and failed to prove his words. Howarth was apprehended at Islington, and placed in confinement. Referring to these events, La Mothe says:—

"There is a Protestant chaplain, who used to serve the Earl of Shrewsbury, who, having come here to impeach the Queen of Scots, and having so much irritated the Queen of England against her, that her life has been in extreme danger, has been carefully watched by a good friend of this Court, who has at length convicted him of imposture, for which he has been condemned to the pillory, and the Queen of Scots remains for the present delivered from this great danger, thanks to our Lord, to whom I pray."[2]

Shrewsbury was extremely indignant at the charge, and pledged his life that it was utterly untrue.

"How can it be imagined," he asked, "I should be disposed to favour this Queen for her claim to succeed the Queen's

[1] Shrewsbury to Walsingham, April 10.—*MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. IX., No. 14.
[2] *Teulet's* La Mothe, v. 6, p. 44.

Majesty? My dealing towards her hath showed the contrary. I know her to be a stranger, a Papist, and my enemy; what hope can I have of good of her, either for me or my country?"

If he could have been freed from the custody of the Queen of Scots, without discredit to himself, Shrewsbury would have been delighted. He says:—

"I shall not only yield willingly thereunto, but think myself most happy to be rid of so weighty and cumbersome charge (the care whereof hath almost brought me to the grave), and would become an humble suitor to the Queen's Majesty for the same."[1]

Six days before writing in this strain, Shrewsbury had expressed to Walsingham the great comfort he found in the Queen's letters assuring him of her good opinion, and said:—

"I will not live to deserve the contrary, but my enemies to serve their own turns give out what they please behind my back. They dare not justify it to my face. I thank God, I am not so void of sense, nor so miserable as they would make me. I have had charge in her Majesty's brother and sister's time, and those that had then or since dealing with me, I trust thought not ill of me. This weighty cumbersome charge I now have is the cause of all their malice to me, being envied for my true service; but having her Majesty's good grace and countenance, I doubt not but that when she shall command me, her people will as willingly serve under me as with any within her realm, and shall find my credit as good as cunning practices would make it seem ill. I have not heretofore desired the continuance of this charge either for love or affection I have borne to her, or gain received by having of her. As the Almighty knoweth me free from the one, so am I able to justify I have not received the other. He that shall succeed me shall find it, if things happen that hath been in this time of my service, if he have my care to deal for the Queen's Majesty's honour, and for this lady's safe keeping, he shall be sure to reap small gain, and less

[1] Shrewsbury to Burghley, April 16.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 117.

quietness of mind. I am bold to trouble you with my long scribbling for that I account you as my dear friend."[1]

The Earl of Shrewsbury's assurances, and Corker's manifest malice, destroyed the sting of the slanders that had been uttered. In May, Lord Talbot was able to comfort his father with the assurance that the affair was almost forgotten in London. Corker then remained a close prisoner in the Fleet, and nothing could be learned of him; but the Queen had spoken to Lord Talbot, saying how well she accepted his father's letter, "with many other comfortable words,"[2] which were promptly reported for the satisfaction of the Earl. He, however, still longed for release from his charge, if it could be had without any blemish to his honour and estimation; and as soon as his son's letter came to hand, he wrote to Lord Burghley, asking his advice as to what was meetest for him to do to her Majesty's best contentment.[3] What advice the Lord Treasurer gave is not apparent, but in July the Earl was troubled with a revival of the slanders of Corker and others, and wrote with his own hand the following furious and indignant letter to Walsingham:—

"I have received your letters, much unworthy to accompany such a reprobate's submission. Nevertheless being fully persuaded your friend's request either moved you thereunto, or else Christian charity chiefly the cause, I cannot but like well thereof, and friendly take the same at your hands. Wherefore as touching that lewd fellow, who hath not only sought by unlawful libels extant, so much as in him lay to deface my duty-

[1] Shrewsbury to Walsingham, April 10.—*MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. IX., No. 14.
[2] Talbot to Shrewsbury, May 10.—*Gatty's* ed. Hunter's Hallamshire, p. 112.
[3] Shrewsbury to Burghley, May 14.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 118.

ful heart and loyalty, but also the rooting up of my house, utter overthrow and destruction of my lineal posterity, I neither hold him a subject nor yet account him worthy the name of a man, which with a watery submission can appease so rigorous a storm; no, if loss of my life, which he hath pretended would have fully contented him, I could better have been satisfied than with these, his unspeakable vileness, and other his detestable misdemeanours. God's just judgment doth now give him this measure, if there were any, though much inferior to his wicked[ness], in respect whereof I might be thought hard-hearted if, for Christianity's sake, I should not freely forgive as cause shall require, and desire God to make him a better member, being so perilous a caterpillar in the commonwealth. For I have not the man anywise in contempt; it is his iniquity and Judas dealing that I only hate. Whereupon to take compassion or remorse my flesh and blood utterly deny, knowing as I am commanded to forgive, so it is most requisite and not repugning the word of God to pluck up or cut down such stinking weeds, able to infect a whole country. Therefore his submission I weigh no more than I do his offer to satisfy the world in what sort I will, with much more, I know not what, as though his credit extended so far, or else as though anything can proceed from his mouth but infamy. Yea, I ensure you, Mr. Secretary, I am the worse when I understand he speaketh of me. And for my unfriends, or the slanderous mouths of Corker [and] his fellow-mates, so long as they blaze but their untruths to despite my faithful service, which my prince and country shall still find in dutiful wise most assured, I can easily despise them and conclude thus: He that serves truly cannot please everybody."[1]

The slanders of Corker and his instigators were made use of by the enemies of the Scotch Queen as an excuse to get her out of the hands of the Earl of Shrewsbury, and reports were set afloat that the Earl of Bedford was to become her keeper. In some

[1] Shrewsbury to Walsingham, July 19.—*MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. IX., No. 32.

alarm, Mary wrote to her Ambassador at Paris, entreating him to remind the Cardinal of Lorraine of her request to procure letters in her favour from Christian princes, and to follow up the Cardinal's solicitations by himself applying to the several Ambassadors, and particularly to the Nuncio.

"I do not desire this without cause," says the Queen, "knowing the practices which are set on foot by my adversaries to place me in the hands of one of them, who is the Earl of Bedford, a man without faith and religion, and who openly declares himself my enemy. My life would be in imminent peril; which, by the information I have before given to M. de la Mothe, I know certainly to be sought after by poison. That wretched Rolson, who betrayed his father, is come to make the overtures and secret practices. I have been secretly informed of the proposals and underhand dealings of Rolson, and for fear of bringing into suspicion those who have shown themselves honest people, and who in this have done me a friendly turn, I have entreated M. de la Mothe not to divulge it, and I also instruct you not to do so. I understand that La Mothe has made some mention of this Rolson, under another pretext, as having been informed of the ill will which he bears me, in order that he should no longer have access where I am; and that since then this Queen has not spoken publicly to Rolson, as she was wont. But he is no less in credit, in so much that having been thrown into prison for debt, she at once released him, against the law, and since has paid for him. I do not like to think that she would consent to such an act of wickedness, but from the arguments used by Rolson, from all the journeys which he has made, and from his demonstrations, there is reason to suspect and fear that the source comes farther than from the Countess of Essex, a relative and intimate friend of this Queen, whom, he said, to have originated the proposal to make overtures to the Countess of Shrewsbury. For he was incautious enough to say as much as this, that if anyone, without the knowledge of this Queen, were to poison me, he knew

on good authority that she would be very much obliged to them for relieving her of so great a trouble. They see that they have missed their aim in this quarter, and in order to recover it, they want to place me in other keeping. I have no security from Shrewsbury, except on the one point of my life, against which, for the reputation of his house, he would not, as I think, permit any attempt to be made while I was in his hands. They seek to find fault with his behaviour, by charges and impostures from certain ministers, although he is of their religion; and, from what I see, their design is to torment him so much, that he will desire to be quit of me."[1]

It is clear, from this letter, that Mary thought better of Shrewsbury than she sometimes admitted. Harsh as he often was in restricting her recreations, he was at least high-minded enough to scorn the idea of assassination. The Queen of Scots felt that her life was safe in his hands, except by legal process, a belief that conveys no trifling compliment, when we remember the views held by princes and nobles of that age about the practice of private murder. A subsequent paragraph of the same letter, which is a long one, affords us the following sketch of a religious difficulty. The Queen says:—

"There has fallen into my hands a book of Hours, corrected by the Pope, with which I should wish to provide my servants; and because there is an edict which prohibits the use of any prayers in the vulgar tongue, my little flock being, God be thanked, all Catholics, I should wish to know if prayer in the vulgar tongue is generally prohibited to those who, after having said their Hours, have private devotions, and especially the Manual in French. Which I beg you will learn from the Nuncio, and request my uncle that he will order some prayers to be said after service by all my household; for some will never pray without that. We have no other practice of religion

[1] Mary to the Archbishop of Glasgow, March 29.—*Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 120.

except the reading of the sermons of M. Picard, to which they all assemble. It will be a charity in you to give the prisoners a rule. We have almost as much leisure as the inmates of a convent."[1]

In a subsequent letter, Mary returns to the subject, saying:—

"I have received the letter of M. Edmond, but I should like to know the pleasure of the Pope, about the prayers in French; for the prohibition is so clear against all prayers in the vulgar tongue, that I do not know what to say. For myself, thank God, I have still sufficient remains of Latin to pray, more than of devotion; but I should like to observe the commands of the Church."[2]

A letter from Shrewsbury to Walsingham, written a few weeks after the above, serves to illustrate both his own carefulness and Elizabeth's jealousy of his dealings with the Queen of Scots. It is dated Sheffield, 16th April, 1574, and says:—

"Having received your letter by one Lyddell, a Scot, servant to this Queen, and perceiving her Majesty's pleasure for his repair hither, I have searched and found all the tokens and other things which he brought, and will be careful of him while he stays. I found amongst the tokens a note, stating that Mons. Vergier, who attends to her dowry in France, has sent silks for my wife (as she asked him when he was here), by a courier to London. For these my wife should pay this Queen about 160 crowns; but I, scrupulous in such matters touching her, will not deliver her any money till her Majesty is acquainted therewith."[3]

[1] *Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 129.

[2] Mary to Glasgow, August, 1574.—*Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 214.

[3] Shrewsbury to Walsingham, April 16.—*MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. IX., No. 15.

CHAPTER XIII.

EVER since her return from Chatsworth, in the autumn of 1573, the Queen of Scots had remained in Sheffield Castle; but as the spring came on, measles broke out in the household, and a change of residence was deemed desirable. On the 29th April, we find the Queen at Sheffield Lodge, writing a long business letter to Du Verger, her chancellor, concerning the affairs of her dowry, complaining that her farms were corruptly let at absurdly low rents, that her uncle, the Cardinal of Lorraine, disposed of seignorial rights, escheats, and other things without her consent; that Puyguillem, master of her household, was guilty of forgery, and generally complaining of everybody, and alleging that she was abominably robbed.

Early in May, Mary had completed the piece of embroidery for which she required the crimson satin and silk, and the silver thread, before referred to. It was a skirt of red satin, very finely worked with silver, and was intended as a present to the Queen of England. In sending it up by Lord Shrewsbury's carrier, packed in a little box, sealed with her seal, Mary desired the French Ambassador to present it to Elizabeth, whom he was to entreat to accept it in good part, "as evidence of the honour which I

bear her, and the desire which I have to employ myself in anything that will be agreeable to her."[1]

In sending this present, Shrewsbury cautioned Walsingham about the measles, saying, "Some in my house are infected with the measles, and it may be dangerous for the Queen to receive anything hence before it has been well aired. God long preserve her. She is a precious jewel to all good men."[2] The offering duly reached its destination, and was favourably received. On the 23rd May, M. de la Mothe says to the French King:—

"The Queen of Scots, your sister-in-law, is very well, and yesterday I presented on her behalf a skirt of crimson satin, worked with silver, very fine, and all worked with her hand, to the Queen of England, to whom the present was very agreeable, for she found it very nice, and has prized it much; and it seemed to me that I found her much softened towards her. I have here some letters of the said Queen, your sister-in-law, written to your Majesty, but I have not yet permission to send them to you."[3]

La Mothe also communicated to the Queen of Scots an account of the way in which her present had been accepted. At once Mary wrote to her "good sister," saying—

"I cannot refrain from assuring you by these lines how happy I should esteem myself, if you would be pleased to permit me to make it my duty to recover by any means whatever some portion of your good graces, in which I most earnestly wish you to be pleased to aid me, by some intimation in what way you think I can gratify and obey you; whenever it is your pleasure, I shall always be ready to give you proofs of the

[1] *Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 160.

[2] Shrewsbury to Walsingham, May 9.—*MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. IX., No. 16.

[3] *Teulet's* La Mothe, v. 6, p. 122.

honour and friendship I bear you. I was very glad that you were pleased to accept the sweetmeats which M. de la Mothe presented to you; I am now writing to Du Verger, my chancellor, to send me a better supply, which you will do me a favour in making use of; and would to God that you would accept my services in more important things, in which I should show such readiness to please, that in a short time you would have a better opinion of me; in the meantime I will wait patiently for some favourable news from you, which I have been expecting for such a long time."[1]

Mention is frequently made in Mary's letters, about this time, of her sending small presents to the Queen, and also to the Earl of Leicester, whose good-will she was anxious to propitiate. The effort was not unattended with success, as we may gather from a letter written by Leicester to Shrewsbury, on the 5th September. He said her Majesty had of late received such tokens very kindly, and before long would send some token in return; and this being a matter of comfort to the Scotch Queen, he thought it well to let her know, as time and occasion might serve.[2] But this intimation proved to be only another sample of the cold comfort on which the Queen of Scots had to subsist. For the moment, however, it served the purpose of encouraging Mary to try the effect of further presents. She wrote expressing her intense satisfaction that the Queen had found her little offerings so agreeable, and declaring how delightful would be a favourable letter from her sister's royal hand. The Queen of Scots was making for Elizabeth a head-dress, with the needful accompaniments, but had so few workers to

[1] *Strickland*, v. 1, 284. [2] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 121.

aid her in delicate work that it was yet not quite finished. She was anxious to work at anything that pleased her sister, could she but know what it was, and meanwhile asked M. de la Mothe to send her six ells of gold lace, ornamented with silver spangles, which, together with some other things, he must either get quickly from France, or if not, choose as well as he could in London.[1]

In November, certain confections arrived from France, half of which were presented on Mary's behalf to the Queen of England; and though somebody put it into Elizabeth's head that they were poisoned, when she tasted of them they proved very good. Elizabeth continued to talk of the promised token, but it never came, and the excuse made at this time was a rumour that the King of France was about to press for Mary's liberty, a step of which Elizabeth complained very much.[2]

To gather together the threads of this narrative, we must here retrace our steps for a short time. On the 8th May, the Queen of Scots wrote two long letters, one to the Archbishop of Glasgow, to soothe his feelings, which had been somewhat disturbed by the very outspoken despatches his mistress had written about the mismanagement of her affairs; and the other to M. de la Mothe Fénélon. In both, she refers to Rollett's continued illness, and her own arduous labours in letter writing. The despatch to the Archbishop affords us a little insight into the mode in which Mary's correspondence was conducted. She says, "I never write letters that others

[1] *Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 222. [2] *Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 235.

dictate. They may, indeed, prepare them; but I look over and correct them, if they convey not my meaning, before I sign them."[1] Further on in the same letter, referring to her *ecuyer de cuisine*, or chief cook, the Queen says:—

"I am not out of danger if my food is not closely watched, and he is the only person here who has the care of it; besides, as I have no apothecary, he makes up all the medicines for me and my household; and I have not been very well since last Lent, when I suffered a good deal from the cold and want of exercise."

In a postscript, Mary adds:—

"I beg you to send me some genuine terra sigillata, if it is to be had for money; if not, ask M., the Cardinal, my uncle, for some; or, if he has none, rather than have recourse to the Queen, my mother-in-law, or to the King, [send] a bit of fine unicorn's horn, as I am in great want of it."

The fear of poison evidently troubled the Queen much at this time. She often refers to it, and her request for "unicorn's horn," shows that she entertained the popular faith in that substance as an antidote.

In her letter to M. de la Mothe, Mary again begs for a passport for Mddle. Rallay; she cannot think that Elizabeth would object to her having such a companion, who is in no respect to be suspected of secret practices, but would serve her, and accompany her in her chamber, as she did in the Queen's youth. Renewing her entreaties to be allowed to take the baths at Buxton, Mary says:—

"Seeing that I derived so much benefit at Buxton for my side and rheumatism, that I have not suffered from it except towards the end of this Lent, although I was there in the latter part of the season, and without having license to purge myself;

[1] *Strickland*, v. 1, p. 276.

therefore if it should please her [Elizabeth] to order Lord Shrewsbury to take me there in better time, and it should be at the end of the coming month, with permission to remain there for three weeks, I would commence to purge myself, and should hope to recover perfect health, for which I shall be much obliged to her; and I feel sure that the King, my good brother, and the Queen, our mother, will feel themselves equally indebted to her. I protest, before God, that I have in this no other object but my health, and if there are any so miserable as to persuade her to the contrary, in order to cause her to neglect the preservation of my life, I pray you ask her to send some one to see whether I have need of it, and to prescribe for me restrictions as it shall please her that I observe; and if I transgress them, let her never do anything again for me. If you are able to obtain this boon this year, I promise her that I will never trouble her for it again, if I had to be all my life where I am." [1]

The request was granted, and early in June Mary was conducted to Buxton, but we have no particulars of the event, nor are any letters written by her during this visit known to exist. She was at Sheffield before her departure, writing to Elizabeth and to the Archbishop of Glasgow, on the 9th and 10th June; and she had returned to Sheffield on the 9th July. In the confessions of Henry Cockyn, taken in the early part of the following year, he is said to have gone to Buxton at Whitsuntide, with letters from the Bishop of Ross. Whitsunday fell on the 30th May, in 1574, when the Queen of Scots was at Sheffield, so that we must assume either that Cockyn, speaking from memory, meant about Whitsuntide, or that he left London at Whitsuntide, on which supposition he might be at Buxton by the time the Queen of Scots arrived.

[1] *Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 159.

Secret messengers were at this time very actively engaged in forwarding the Queen's correspondence. Among the practicers were, Alexander Hamilton, tutor to the two younger sons of the Earl of Shrewsbury; John, the musician, who played the bass violin; Morgan, Dick Baines, Cuthbert Reid, John Gray, Archie Beton, Thomas Burley, a glover, in Sheffield town, and others. Hamilton, as his name indicates, was a Scotchman. At the beginning of 1573, on the recommendation of Walsingham, he was engaged from France by Shrewsbury, as a tutor for his boys, and gave the utmost satisfaction to the Earl, who found him learned and diligent. His children profited greatly by his instruction, and the Earl interested himself with the Queen of Scots on his behalf, to procure the restitution of a pension he had enjoyed in France. For three quarters of a year he taught Henry and Edward Talbot, at a house of the Earl's, "10 miles" away, but becoming "vehemently troubled with the stone," he came to Sheffield, to receive medicine from the Queen of Scots' doctor. Not obtaining relief from this treatment, he went to London, and stayed there awhile, and on his return resumed the tuition of the young Talbots, at a house of the Earl's, at Handsworth. Shrewsbury never could perceive otherwise than well of him, and heartily hoped that he might be able to clear himself of suspicion.[1] He was sent up to London, and there examined touching his acquaintance with the Queen of Scots, his conveyance of messages and letters, and other particulars;

[1] Shrewsbury to Walsingham, June 6.—*MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. IX., No. 17.

but he took God to record, that since he first came to this country, he never knew any Scotch or English coming and going with messages between the Queen of Scots and others. He never spoke to the Queen of Scotland but in the presence of Lord Shrewsbury, when his honour sent for him to examine his children in his presence, "the Queen of Scotland coming to his chamber by our expectation." [1]

Notwithstanding Hamilton's very specific denials, equally specific charges were preferred against him. The Earl of Morton, Regent of Scotland, sent word that a boy, lately come to Scotland from the Scotch Queen, directed to George Douglas and Lord Seaton, conveying letters, confessed that while serving not far from Sheffield, Mr. Alexander Hamilton, a Scot, schoolmaster to Shrewsbury's children, sent asking him to meet him at Doncaster. He accordingly did so, and had three or four hours talk with Hamilton, who gave him letters to convey into Scotland, and instructed him to bring back the answers to the "Read [Red] Bull," in Doncaster, where he would meet him. If he missed him, he was to send word to Thomas Burley, glover, of Sheffield, who would advertise Hamilton to come or send for the letters. The boy, coming through England with letters and messages, met "a man of the Lord of Buccleuch's, of reasonable good stature, having a little black round beard, a blue jerkin, white hose, a black cap, without a cloak, that hath long been a traveller with letters between the Scotch Queen and the Lady Livingstone; a

[1] Answers of Alexander Hamilton.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IX., No. 19.

woman called Janet, high of stature and yellow hair, living at black Jamie Simson's wife in Edinburgh." Robert Liddell, sometime servant to George Douglas, a bastard son of James Lauder's, who was with the Queen, was the person who first communicated with him, and induced him to leave his master, and meet Mr. Alexander Hamilton.[1] Killigrew, in Scotland, also sent information about the dealings of the King of Spain in the affairs of the Queen of Scots, and on this point Hamilton was also expected to throw some light; but after various close questionings, nothing could be proved, and he returned to his duties at Sheffield, expressing himself greatly bound to Walsingham, who seems to have held him in some regard. Shrewsbury, according to Walsingham's advice, gave Hamilton an earnest word of caution, and charged him for his own benefit and full purgation to desire from the Regent an opportunity of disproving the matters bruited about, or that could be objected against him.[2]

Hamilton's arrest, however, had caused some little consternation among the adherents of the Queen of Scots. It was at the beginning of June that Shrewsbury was directed to send him to London, and just then his services were proving specially valuable to the captive Queen. One Henry Cockyn, a London bookseller, had abandoned his lawful trade to become a messenger in the service of that Queen. He it was who made the secret journeys;

[1] Extract of a letter from the Earl of Morton, Regent of Scotland.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IX., No. 29.

[2] Shrewsbury to Walsingham, Sep. 26.—*MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. IX., No. 36.

and Hamilton managed the communications between the Queen and the messenger. When Mary heard of Hamilton's arrest, therefore, though somewhat discomposed, she comforted herself with the hope that nothing had been discovered, nor was likely to be. She had heard of Killigrew's intelligence from Scotland, and fancied Hamilton's supposed dealings with the King of Spain were all that could be alleged against him. Knowing very well that his practices lay in another direction, she awaited with composure the issue of the examination. Hamilton's return from London, in September, seemed to justify her confidence, but the arrest of Cockyn, at the beginning of 1575, threw quite another light on the matter. When the Queen of Scots was writing to the Archbishop of Glasgow about Hamilton, she was also giving evidence of her appreciation of Cockyn's services, by directing M. de la Mothe to pay him a pension of 100 crowns a year. In a letter to La Mothe, dated Sheffield, 4th August, she says:

"I write to my Ambassador to request him to send me some more money, and assign a pension of one hundred crowns annually to Cockyn, as secret messenger between us, which you will please always to pay to him, and very secretly; and besides what remains of my money then, you will give him something to defray his journeys to me, paying him promptly, which I beg you to give him, for he has had nothing from me for all his journeys; and I hope you will find him convenient for the King's service as well as for mine, if well maintained without being detected. To which I beg you will have an eye, for I shall cause all the information which comes to the knowledge of my several friends, who more than ever have a care for me, to be sent to you secretly when haste is required; and what-

ever is directed to myself, or that otherwise I can discover, I promise faithfully to let you know, and that I shall be no less vigilant for the King, my good brother, than for myself."[1]

To the Archbishop of Glasgow, writing on the same day, the Queen says:—

"It is necessary that I should maintain the person who always, at the risk of his life, travels for me between this and London. I purpose to pay him one hundred crowns per annum, by the hand of M. de la Mothe; besides which, for his extraordinary journeys, I shall order the said M. de la Mothe to pay him out of what money of mine he has in his hands, for it is necessary that he should send others frequently. Consult as to his remuneration with the Bishop of Ross, who knows him; his name is Cockyn."[2]

The arrest of Cockyn, in January, 1575, afforded further evidence of Hamilton's connection with the affairs of the Queen of Scots, and led to his being once more sent to London, and interrogated in the Tower, where he confessed to some of the charges Cockyn had alleged against him.[3]

The examinations and confessions of Cockyn and his accomplices form a considerable bulk in the tenth volume of the Queen of Scots' manuscripts in the Public Record Office; and as late as November 18th, 1575, we find a memorandum of "Interrogatories ministered to Mr. Alexander Hamilton, and his replies, as to his visits to Scotland, and the alleged conveyance of letters from the Queen of Scots."[4]

A letter of the Queen of Scots, written to the Archbishop of Glasgow, from Sheffield, on the 9th

[1] *Turnbull*, p. 234. [2] *Turnbull*, p. 243.
[3] Hamilton's Confession, May 21, 1575.—*MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. x., No. 62.
[4] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. x., No. 72, 1.

July, is interesting from the insight it gives into the amusements of her prison life. Queen Mary says:—

"I have nothing particular to say at present, except that, thank God, I am in better health than I was before my baths, during which I wrote to you. As to the rest, I pray you procure for me some turtle-doves, and some Barbary fowls, to see if I can rear them in this country (as your brother tells me that you have raised some in a cage, and also some red partridges at your place), and by-and-bye send some one to bring them as far as London, who will send me the proper instructions. I shall take great pleasure in bringing them up in a cage, as I do all the little birds that I am able to obtain. These are pastimes for a prisoner, and especially there are none in this country. I wrote to you not long ago; I pray you take care that my instructions are followed, and I will pray God have you in his keeping." [1]

Writing to the Archbishop again, on the 18th July, the Queen tells him that she is a "little better" than she was before she went to the baths, but—

"As for Rollett, he has been expected to die twice within the last fortnight, and it will be a long time before he can assist me with writing, even if he should recover, of which I see no great likelihood, being in a confirmed consumption, or I am much mistaken; he wheezes continually, and is quite bent, nevertheless he says he is very well, sometimes even, during the last two days, he says he is sure to get better."

Notwithstanding Rollett's sanguine anticipations, Mary felt it desirable to be provided with a successor, and asked her uncle, the Cardinal, to send some one to take his place. She continues:—

"If you have permission to send some one to me with my accounts, send by-and-bye Jean de Compiegne, and let him bring me patterns of dresses, and samples of cloth of gold and silver and

[1] *Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 183.

silk, the most beautiful and rare that are worn at Court, to learn my pleasure about them. Order Poissy to make me a couple of head-dresses, with a crown of gold and silver, such as they have formerly made for me; and Breton to remember his promise, and obtain for me from Italy the newest fashions in head-dresses, and veils, and ribbons, with gold and silver, and I will repay whatever they may cost him. Remember the birds about which I wrote you lately."[1]

The Queen of Scots had, through some of her channels of communication, been informed that the Earl of Leicester contemplated making her an offer of marriage, and as a matter of policy, she seemed quite ready to entertain the proposal. Through M. de la Mothe she urged her uncle, the Cardinal, to make Leicester a present.

"They say," she remarks, "that the Earl of Leicester endeavours to gain Walsingham's approval of his suit for me; if it is so you will know it, and I shall write to you how they advise me to behave in the matter; but I do not believe it."[2]

In a letter of the same date to the Archbishop of Glasgow, the Queen of Scots says:—

"Now to begin, you know that there are factions in this kingdom; one of the Puritans, in favour of Huntingdon, who is privily supported by Leicester; another of Burleigh, for Hertford; and the third for the poor Catholics; and of all these the Queen is the enemy, and only considers Hatton, Walsingham, and several others, at all free from suspicion, expressing herself thus, that she would wish to return after her death, to see the murders, quarrels, and divisions in this country. 'For,' says she, 'Leicester flatters Hertford, and stands for his own brother-in-law, and the others would like to be rid of me. But if the third come (speaking of me), she will soon take off their heads.' And therefore she has persuaded the said Hatton neither to

[1] *Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 186.
[2] Mary to La Mothe, Aug. 4.—*Turnbull*, p. 236.

purchase lands nor build houses, for, if she were dead, he could not live. Yet Leicester talks over M. de la Mothe, to persude me that he is wholly for me, and endeavours to gain over Walsingham, my mortal enemy, to this effect. Burleigh writes very civilly of me, when he thinks that it will come to my ears, protesting that he will not, like others, suffer anything to be said to him against me (he alludes to Leicester), as the nearest relative of the Queen, and whom he desires to honour, as far as I shall not offend his mistress. Notwithstanding Bedford, who is entirely Leicester's, as he himself has caused me to be informed, solicits to have me, to persuade me to come to it. But recently they have charged him with the knowledge of a conspiracy against the life of Burleigh, of which he is acquitted. I do not know what will be the result, but they have little confidence in each other. . . . For the rest, there is so much evil in this country, that there is nothing else. Burleigh even is in discredit, and meddles no more in affairs than to endeavour to please, especially the Catholics in the Tower of London. My keeper is always suspected; but they fear so much this new king, and this Spanish army, that seeing it defies them, they suffer it to pass along for a time. Dr. Wilson, my great enemy, has said to a creature of my keeper, and of quality, that he would be glad to get rid of me, for otherwise they would endeavour to do me a bad turn, or make me suffer in his hands, which would be disgraceful to him, and they know would not be to his liking. My friends here, the more they are persecuted the better they love and esteem me."

In a portion of the letter addressed specially to the Cardinal of Lorraine, the Queen repeats this politic advice:—

"But M. de la Mothe advises me to entreat that my cousin of Guise, my grandmother and yours, will write some civil letters to Leicester, thanking him for his courtesy to me, as if he had done much for me, and by the same medium send him some handsome present, which will do me much good. He takes great delight in furniture, if you send him some crystal cup in your name, and allow me to pay for it, or some fine

Turkey carpet, or such like as you may think most fitting, it will perhaps save me this winter, and will make him much ashamed, or suspected by his mistress, and all will assist me. For he intends to make me speak of marriage or die, as it is said, so that either he or his brother may have to do with this crown. I beseech you to try if such small device can save me, and I shall entertain him with the other at a distance." [1]

Mary accurately estimated Leicester's character. She was willing to use him to gain her liberty, if that were possible, but felt all the time that he "would never be any thing but false." [2]

The illness of Rollett was now rapidly approaching its fatal termination. In an undated letter, obviously written about the middle of August, to the Archbishop of Glasgow, the Queen says of her Secretary :—

"He is a faithful servant, and very skilful in his profession, but ill, suspicious, and melancholy. He cannot keep friendly one day with any one at present. He has twice or three times sent for me to make his will, and then does nothing but make childish complaints to me, for instance about his valets who are tampered with, and who rob him. One day he runs after them, and wants to kill them; he is quite bent,—he seizes cloak and sword—is not able to walk, and then goes back to bed. In short, he is so ill that he cannot write, and always jealous lest one should write without him, which I have never done yet, except the line in my last letter, that he has not seen, and this one, which he knows nothing at all about, because if he had, he would have wanted to make the rough copies and detained me too long; and so we should have had some dispute before finishing, for he wishes La Mothe to make the communications, saying it is not necessary for me to have an Ambassador in France. Do not appear to know anything about it. It is a pity what troubles he gives himself, and he is

[1] *Turnbull*, pp. 238-245. [2] *Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 247.

always once a month at the point of death, and throws the blame on those who have compassion on him, and does nothing but invent quarrels about nothing. He has twice asked to have a passport, and has always fallen back on the bed. I should wish to have here one who is able to help me, for he has written nothing except rough copies for nearly a year, and perhaps he may be able to recover his health. I much fear that he will not get it [the passport], for they have advised me not to ask it, for they suspect, according to their old suspicion, that it is to traffic with the King about the transfer of my rights; and even if he does obtain it, I am sure he will not get through the first day before having to take to his bed again. He is quite consumptive, and, as the physician says, he has other diseases of long standing. He has quarrelled with the said physician, more than a year ago, and will have nothing to do with him or his advice. The attendant looks after him very well, but the disease is incurable, and he so impatient and suspicious, that each one by turns is obliged to leave him. I dare not say anything to him about this despatch, and for the same reason write to me separately of the receipt of it." [1]

The struggle, however, was soon over, and the miserable man passed away. Mary thus refers to his death, in a letter dated 4th September:—

"It has pleased God to take out of this misery and place in his glory Rollett, my Secretary, on the 30th August, at eight o'clock in the morning, and so suddenly, that, having sent to see him, as my custom was in the morning, he was breathing his last, so that he said nothing at his death what he had before requested of me. I have placed in writing, as nearly as I can remember, in a letter which I have written to M. Ferrarius and to Hoteman, which you will ask to see, and by them to accept the charge which he has left them, and inform me what they will do about it. He has left me the gift of five thousand francs which I lately made to him, saying that he had enough to fulfil his last wishes. You will enquire about this, and if it

[1] *Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 211.

is so, withdraw the said sum from Hoteman or the Treasurer, for one of the two has received it for him, [and keep it] until you hear further of my intention. For the rest you will use diligence to send me some one to act as secretary, for I could not act in that capacity any longer myself, if my life depended upon it."[1]

As soon as Rollett was dead, Shrewsbury, thinking that he possessed "the hole knolege of the hole secretes" of his mistress, took possession of his keys, and searched his coffers, "which this Lady bad me look I had good warrant so to do, for answer it I must." Nothing of any importance was found. Mary had doubtless taken care to remove any papers likely to cause inconvenience. "The money he had in his coffer was 280 French crowns, which this lady has taken upon her to dispose. It is thought he hath much money in France, that this lady looks to have."[2] Mary complained, as she had threatened, of this violation of her Secretary's coffers, and the matter was mentioned by Walsingham to Shrewsbury. In reply, the Earl said, "I do not consider her letters or speech in respect of my duty to her Majesty, and am willing from time to time to give her like cause of offence."[3]

Rollett was buried at Sheffield on the 4th September, the Parish Register recording the fact in these simple words, "1574, 4 Sep., sep. Petrus Roollett, gallus."

Soon afterwards the Queen of Scots was removed to Sheffield Lodge, whence she wrote to the Arch-

[1] *Labanoff*, v. 4, 216.

[2] Shrewsbury to Walsingham, Aug. 31.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 119.

[3] Shrewsbury to Walsingham, Sept. 26.—*MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. IX., No. 36.

bishop of Glasgow, on the 22nd September, about the affairs of her dowry, adding:—

"If M. the Cardinal of Guise, my uncle, has gone to Lyons, I feel sure he will send me a couple of pretty little dogs, and you will buy me some also, for besides reading and working, I take pleasure only in all the little animals that I can get. You must send them me in baskets very warmly [packed]."[1]

During the month of October, or perhaps early in November,[2] the ill-starred marriage of Darnley's younger brother, Charles Stuart, Earl of Lennox, with Elizabeth Cavendish, was brought about by the ambitious intrigues of that lady's mother. The Countess of Shrewsbury had, for a year past, been in treaty for a marriage between her daughter and a son of the Duchess of Suffolk, but, hearing that the Countess of Lennox and the young Earl were about to pass through her neighbourhood, the idea seems to have suggested itself that two strings to the bow might be advantageous. At all events she resolved to be hospitable and polite. Consulting with her husband as to the desirability of inviting the travellers to Chatsworth, it was settled between them that Rufford Abbey would be a more suitable place at which to receive guests so nearly connected with the Queen of Scots. That house was accordingly prepared for company. Queen Elizabeth, in taking leave of the Countess of Lennox, who

Labanoff, v. 4, p. 228.

[2] I have ventured to suggest this variation from the usually accepted date, on the strength of two passages in a letter from Shrewsbury to Burghley, dated "Sheffield, 5th November, 1574," in which he refers to the marriage as still in the future. He says, "such liking was between them, as my wife tells me she makes no doubt of a match." A little further on, he says, "This taking effect, I shall be well at quiet," &c.—*Cotton MSS., Caligula*, c. III.

was on her way to Scotland, thought it necessary to caution her against going to Chatsworth. She was jealous of the mother-in-law coming within twelve miles of the captive daughter, but Lady Lennox made light of the suspicion that she could have any dealings with the Queen of Scots; was she not flesh and blood, and could she ever forget the murder of her child?[1] At Newark, however, a temptation was cast in the path of the travellers. The invitation to visit Rufford afforded an opportunity for a good talk with the Countess of Shrewsbury, about Mary and her affairs, without disobeying the Queen's injunctions against Chatsworth. The Countess, too, was very pressing, for she not only sent a messenger, but came herself, to give force to her entreaty. Lady Lennox was weary and sick, the house was not a mile out of her way, "yea, and a much fairer way," while the prospect of gratification to a mother-in-law's curiosity was too obvious to need any urging. The invitation was accepted, and the mischief was quickly done. According to Shrewsbury's account, the travellers rested at Rufford five days, during most of which time Lady Lennox kept her bed-chamber; and while Lady Shrewsbury was politely bearing her company, and talking scandal—

"The young man, her son, fell into liking with my wife's daughter, before intended, . . . and such liking was between them as my wife tells me she makes no doubt of a match, and hath so tied themselves upon their own liking as . . . cannot part. . . . The young man is so far in love, that belike he is

[1] Countess of Lennox to Leicester.—*MSS. Dom. Eliz.*, v. 99, No. 12, 1.

sick without her. This taking effect, I shall be well at quiet; for there is few noblemen's sons in England that she hath not prayed me to deal for at one time or other." [1]

Charles Stuart, Earl of Lennox, descended through the female line from Henry VII., and uncle to the King of Scots, was no mean match; and Elizabeth of Hardwick was not the mother to neglect such an opportunity. When Lady Lennox left her bedroom, she found the mischief done. Her son, "had entangled himself, so that he could have none other;" and she appeals to the Earl of Leicester's common sense, "whether it was not most fitly for me to marry them, he being mine only son and comfort that is left me." [2] The nuptials were not long delayed. Shrewsbury pleads in December that "it was dealt in suddenly," without his knowledge (thereby contradicting his letter of November 5th); but his wife, he says, had no "other interest or respect than with reverent duty towards your Majesty she ought." [3]

Elizabeth's anger, however, blazed forth. She could not look on quietly and see a member of the royal house married without her approval. She suspected the designs of Lennox and of Shrewsbury, and even imagined that the Queen of Scots was a party to the plot. There can be no doubt that at this time the Queen of Scots was on excellent terms with the Countess of Shrewsbury, and on bad terms with the Countess of Lennox. The answer of Lady Lennox to the caution of Queen Elizabeth shows that she regarded the Queen of Scots as the mur-

[1] Shrewsbury to Burghley, Nov. 5.—*Cotton MSS., Caligula*, c. III.
[2] Countess of Lennox to Leicester, Dec. 3.—*MSS. Eliz. Dom.*, v. 99, No. 12, 1.
[3] Shrewsbury to the Queen, Dec. 2.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 123.

dress of her son; while La Mothe mentions, among the inconveniences likely to arise from the match, his fear lest the Countess of Lennox, having made friends with the Countess of Shrewsbury, should cause that lady to become the enemy of the Queen of Scots.[1]

Elizabeth was always ready to credit the Queen of Scots with intrigue, and so angry was she against her at this time, that M. de la Mothe regarded her life as in serious danger. The opportunity was seized to inspire new suspicions of Shrewsbury's fidelity, and the friends of the Queen of Scots were greatly alarmed lest she should really be removed from his custody. Mary wrote to her uncle of Lorraine, on the 8th November, saying, "for two months I have thought that I should be placed in the hands of Huntingdon, who seeks my death by all means, without my having done anything to offend him; and at present you will see, by my Ambassador's letter, the danger in which I am of being removed, and without my fault."[2]

[1] *Teulet's* La Mothe, v. 6, p. 293.—There is also a letter of about this date, written by the Countess of Shrewsbury to the Queen of Scots, in very friendly and confidential terms, from which it would appear as if the Countess herself could on occasion act as one of the conveyers of letters for the captive. The following is the letter:—

[Countess of Shrewsbury to Mary Queen of Scots.]

"Madam, I most humble thanke you, that yt pleased you to make me partakar of so welcome a letter. Non wysheth hym better then I. Your lettell pore creatuar showed more gladnes then was to be louked for in one doble her years. She and the rest most humble thanks your Maty. that yt wyll pleas you to remembar them. I have sent iiij. letters wch. I desyar may be showed, yf yt seme good to your Maty. to wright as ys requeared. I beseche you send yt by thys bearar. I dare assuar ther shall come no harme of yt. I beseche you wryt earnestly, and so being not well I humble take my leave.

"Thys Monday lat at nyght.

"Yf yt please you I think yt as good or better to wryt to my sonne to be showed, and the letter shall be retourned."—*Holograph, MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. IX., No. 38.

[2] *Turnbull*, 246.

Removal was Mary's great dread, and she besought the King of France to intercede for the preservation of her life, or, if the worst came to the worst, to avenge her death.

The Countess of Lennox, after accomplishing the marriage, returned to London at the beginning of December, having tried to allay the storm at Court by humble explanations and propitiatory letters. Elizabeth, however, was very stern, and fears were entertained that the offenders might be sent to the Tower. Through the entreaty of powerful friends that extremity was spared; but Lady Lennox, her son, and her new daughter-in-law, spent Christmas in confinement in their own lodgings, forbidden to speak to any member of the Privy Council. On the 12th December, M. de la Mothe informed the Queen Mother of France, that he was in great dread of the practices going on to change the guardian of the Queen of Scots. "True it is," he says, "that the resolution has not yet been taken, and I am doing my best to ensure that it never shall be. I therefore hope, if the Earl of Shrewsbury will make himself a little awkward, on his side, as there is every appearance that he will, that things will remain as they are, and nothing will be done to take her away from him."[1]

Mary, on her part, fell back upon presents and fair speeches. On the 13th December, she sent to Elizabeth, by the hands of M. de la Mothe, an *accoutrement de reseuil*, with many pretty compliments. Having so little help, she could not make such

[1] *Teulet's* La Mothe, v. 6, p. 319.

presents as often as she desired, but if Rallay might come, and bring her daughter, there would then be some one to invent and work out novelties—a delicate appeal to her sister's cupidity. The Queen, however, was not melted, and for several months the Lennox family remained under surveillance. On the 14th May, Gilbert Talbot reported to his mother-in-law a visit to Hackney, where Lady Lennox had a mansion. He found the family well, and adds, "I trust very shortly that the dregs of all misconstructions will be wiped away, that their abode there after this sort will be altered."[1]

Shrewsbury fancied there must be some other reason to account for the outcry that was raised, than mere jealousy of the marriage. Writing to Lord Burghley, on the 27th December, he says:—

"I must be plain with your Lordship. It is not the marriage matter, nor the hatred some bear to my Lady Lennox, my wife, nor to me, that makes this great ado, and occupies heads with so many devices; it is a greater matter; which I leave to conjecture, not doubting but your Lordship's wisdom hath foreseen it, and thereof had due consideration, as always you have been most careful for it."[2]

"The greater matter," was doubtless some intrigue about the Queen of Scots, and Shrewsbury probably referred to the attempt to get her removed from his custody. The danger of that was, however, averted, and on the 19th January, M. de la Mothe was able to assure the French King that, accidents apart, his sister-in-law would not be removed out of Shrewsbury's hands.[3]

[1] *Gatty's* Hunter's Hallamshire, p. 113. [2] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 126.

[3] *Teulet's* La Mothe, v. 6, p. 357.—The suspicions arising in the mind of Elizabeth out of the Lennox marriage leave traces of their existence as late as

Several months before the time of which we write, Mary's relations with the French Court had undergone an unfavourable change. Charles IX., who entertained some feeling of affection for his old play-mate, died at the end of May, and his brother, Henry III., elected in the preceding year King of Poland, succeeded him. Mary was profuse in her congratulations to the new sovereign, and affected to believe that he would take up her cause in earnest. He was, however, in no position to do so. With some difficulty Henry stole away from Poland and reached his hereditary kingdom, where he found sufficient occupation in dealing with domestic dissension, without adding to his troubles by a quarrel with Elizabeth. So far from doing more for Mary than his brother had done, he did less, and towards the end of this year we find the Queen of Scots, for the first time, hotly combating a suggestion made by France to recognise her son as king.[1]

On the 26th December, the Cardinal of Lorraine died at Avignon, and thus another link which bound the Queen of Scots to France was severed. If the Cardinal had made rather a freer use of his niece's dowry than was quite consistent with common honesty, he had been in the main her good friend, and his death was a serious loss to her cause. The news of it, however, did not reach Sheffield until

May 1st, 1576, when the Earl of Leicester officially conveyed to the Earl of Shrewsbury an intimation of the Queen's pleasure, that the Countess of Shrewsbury might repair at all times to the Queen of Scots; her Majesty "having not only very good opinion of my Lady's wisdom and discretion, but thinks how convenient it is for that Queen to be accompanied and pass the time rather with my lady than meaner persons."—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 148.

[1] *Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 243.

the middle of February, when Mary at once wrote to M. de la Mothe expressing her deep regret, and making use of the opportunity to solicit the good offices of the King and his mother.[1]

In ignorance of the Cardinal's death, Mary had written to him on the 9th January, 1575, a long letter, in which she sought with much skill to incite the French Court actively to espouse her cause. She appealed to the feelings, as well as to the fears of the King, and showed no mean proficiency in those persuasive arts to which weakness is compelled to resort. Passing from the region of high politics, she descended to finance, and addressed her requests to the Archbishop of Glasgow, her ambassador. Would his Lordship be so obliging as to send some money, for her servants were already in mutiny for want of their wages. And besides this she wanted, as usual, some little presents.

"Obtain for me, I pray you, a fine gold mirror, to hang from the waist, with a chain to hang it to; and let there be upon the mirror a cipher of this Queen, and mine, and some appropriate motto which the Cardinal, my uncle, will suggest. There are some of my friends in this country who ask for my portrait. I pray you, have four of them made, which must be set in gold, and sent to me secretly, and as soon as possible."[2]

Does not this passage throw some light on that curious subject, the portraiture of Mary Stuart? Likenesses bearing her name abound in the old houses of England, yet few of them can be proved genuine, and many are utterly irreconcilable with the idea that they represent the same face. This letter offers a solution of the puzzle. The portraits

[1] *Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 263. [2] *Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 248.

were ordered from France, probably copied hastily from some picture there, and were distributed rather as tokens of recognition, than with any idea of recalling the features of a familiar face. Some would go to persons who had never seen the Queen of Scots, and would be prized, not because they were likenesses, but because they were her gifts. Hence we find all those strange diversities of feature and of complexion which have perplexed enquirers, and led some to ask whether the Queen of Scots were a chameleon in her frequent changes of appearance.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE Queen of Scots commenced the new year somewhat dolefully. The French Court was urging her to grant the title of King to her son; the Cardinal, her uncle, was removed by death, and the Queen herself was under suspicion because of the Lennox marriage. To add to these causes of perplexity and trouble, some of her secret messengers were arrested in Berwick, bearing letters out of Scotland, and M. de la Mothe was doubtful whether the circumstance might not lead to the more rigorous treatment of Mary herself. Still he comforted the King, his master, who perhaps scarcely needed it, with the assurance that he would provide the best remedy that might be possible under the circumstances.[1] To the Duchess de Nemours, Mary could write of nothing, save the evils she endured.[2] To the Archbishop of Glasgow, referring to the death of her uncle, the Cardinal, she pours out her complaint:—

"Alas! I am a prisoner, and God has taken from me the one of all his creatures whom I most loved. What can I say more? He has deprived me at one blow of my father and my uncle: I shall follow when it pleases Him, with less regret. . . . I had no need to be told of this event, as I had a frightful dream, from which I awoke fully convinced of that which was subsequently confirmed."[3]

[1] *Teulet's* La Mothe, v. 6, p. 362.
[2] *Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 261. [3] *Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 267.

The conjecture of La Mothe proved correct. Not only were messengers arrested at Berwick, but Henry Cockyn, of whom we have heard before, was under examination in London, and implicated Hamilton, Thomas Leslie, and a number of others concerned in the affairs of the Queen of Scots. Walsingham requested Shrewsbury, at the end of February, to send up certain of his servants, and the Earl in complying, said :—

"Assured I am the lady cannot use conference with any man that is mine, neither any my servants permitted to have recourse where she is: If they deal with her people, it is very secretly done, for I am as careful as may be to meet with their doings. The mislike her Majesty [hath] of my son Gilbert's wife brought to bed in my house, as cause of women and strangers repair thither, makes me heartily sorry; nevertheless, the midwife excepted, none such have, or do at any time come within her sight; and at the first, to avoid such resort, I myself with two of my children, christened the child. What intelligence passeth for this Queen to and from my house I do not know; but trust her Majesty shall find my service, while I live, both true and faithful. Yet be you assured, my lord, this lady will not stay to put in practice or make enquiry by all means she can devise, and ask me no leave, so long as such access of her people is permitted unto her."[1]

About this time a natural phenomenon added to the disquiet and anxiety of the household at Sheffield. An earthquake, of unusual severity for this country, occurred on the 26th of February, and was felt not only in Sheffield, but in the district around. In describing the occurrence to Lord Burghley, Shrewsbury says :—

"My Lord, where there hath been often bruits of this lady's escape from me; the 26th of February last there came an earth-

[1] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 128.

quake which so sunk chiefly her chamber, as I doubted more her falling than her going, she was so afraid; but God be thanked, she is forthcoming; and grant it may be a forwarning unto her. It hath been at the same instant in sundry places; no hurt was done, and the same continued a very small time; God grant us all grace to fear him."[1]

Shrewsbury's letter is dated March 3rd, 1575. In a letter to the French Ambassador, dated "ce second de Mars," the Queen of Scots says:—

"We have had here, even in my chamber, a great earthquake, on the evening of Saturday, the 16th ult.; insomuch that my women could not sit steady on their boxes and chairs, where they were working round me. I have heard that it was at the same hour and day in several other places of this country. God, by his mercy, deliver us from all evil; but I ought not to fear that He will let worse befal me than He has already done. God preserve us all."[2]

[1] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 128.

[2] *Turnbull*, xi. I have ventured to assign this letter to 1575, in opposition to the judgment of Prince Labanoff, who places it in 1584, and that for the following reasons. It seems highly improbable, on the face of it, that on two separate Februaries, nine years apart, the Castle of Sheffield should have been shaken by an earthquake; but if we pass from general probabilities to the details of the letter, we shall find this view strengthened. The Queen of Scots speaks of the earthquake as occuring on Saturday evening, February 16. The Earl of Shrewsbury says it happened on the 26th February, without specifying the day of the week. Now it so happens that the 26th February, 1575, was a Saturday, and the Queen is more likely to be correct in the day of the week than in the day of the month. The Queen's letter, moreover, exists only as a contemporary copy, and it is easy to suppose 26 to have been changed by the scribe into 16. But if we turn to the year 1584, we shall find the day and the date irreconcilable. The new style of dating came into use in Roman Catholic countries in October 1582, but Mary Stuart continued to the end of her life to date according to the old style. But whether we assume this letter to be dated according to the old or the new style, Saturday still fails to fit the 16th February. According to the old style, February 16, 1584, fell on a Sunday, and according to the new style on a Thursday, so that neither date agrees with the statement of the letter. The 26th February, old style, 1584, was a Wednesday, and new style a Sunday, so that the letter is utterly irreconcilable with the calendar of that year. The internal evidence is also in favour of 1575, and against 1584. The Queen refers to her communications with the Earl of Leicester, which we have seen were on foot during the latter part of 1574; and asks that some information about them may be sent by her Secretary. In March, 1575, the Queen was anxiously expecting the arrival of Nau as successor to Rollett; in March 1584, Nau was busy at Sheffield conducting his mistress's correspondence. Mary also speaks of having sprained her foot "before the departure of Lesleu," and in 1575, we find Thomas Leslie among those suspected of having had recent communications with her. On these grounds I venture to think that the letter belongs to 1575, and not to 1584.

As alarm was the worst consequence that followed the earthquake, it would soon be got over, while the serious reflections the startling event seems to have induced in the minds both of Shrewsbury and the Queen of Scots, would help each the better to bear the peculiar hardships of their lot.

Mary's kindness to her servants frequently manifested itself both in acts of polite consideration, and in substantial rewards. She busied herself to obtain preferments for the churchmen in her employ, and gave gifts, almost beyond her means, to exiled Scotchmen, and to men who had risked their lives in her cause. During the month of February, in which her own comforts were in such jeopardy, and her mind distracted with sad news, we find her pressing a suit to the Cardinal of Lorraine for a priory for the Archbishop of Glasgow, and using the good offices of her Ambassador to help Lady Seaton in her affairs.

"I had forgotten," she adds, to the Archbishop, "to beg you to stand sponsor in my name for M. du Vergier's infant; if it is a boy, name him after yourself; if a girl, Antoinette. You know the custom; and will give the present and the money to the attendants in the usual manner. A chain for the waist, and one to place round the neck, of moderate price, will suffice until a better opportunity." [1]

A few days afterwards, Mary renewed her attempts to mitigate the severity of Elizabeth by presents. Writing on the 11th March to the King of France, M. de la Mothe informs him that he had presented three night dresses to the Queen, the work of the Queen of Scots, and after some hesitation Elizabeth

[1] *Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 269.

accepted them, praying him to remind her good cousin of the difference in their years, and to say that those who are advanced in life willingly take with two hands, and only give with one finger.[1]

Mary frequently urged on her friends in France the desirability of providing a secretary to take the place of Rollett, and after the Cardinal of Lorraine's death, it was arranged that his Secretary, Nau, should be transferred to the Queen of Scots. On the 29th March, Elizabeth sent to the Earl of Shrewsbury a formal approval of the appointment,[2] and the man, who afterwards played so prominent and so disgraceful a part in betraying his mistress, became a member of the household at Sheffield.

The disclosures made in London during the spring, by the examinations of Cockyn, Atterlowe, Alexander Hamilton, Lord Henry Howard, and others, led to renewed vigilance on the part of Shrewsbury in intercepting Mary's correspondence and restricting her liberty. La Mothe, writing on the 12th May to the King of France, thus describes the proceedings:—

"They are making great enquiries here about the Queen of Scots, and have already placed five persons of quality in the Tower, and examined two Lords, and have sent for three servants of the Earl of Shrewsbury's, in order to ascertain by whom and how the packets and ciphers of the said lady have been conveyed, and what negotiations she has carried on with Guoaras, agent of the King of Spain. I do all I can to moderate this, and do not discontinue the kindly negotiations in spite of all these checks, and will continue as usual to convey the little presents and letters, and other honourable communications on behalf of the said lady, to the Queen, her

[1] *Teulet's* La Mothe, v. 6, p. 397. [2] *Ellis's Letters*, v. 2, p. 277.

cousin, who has not yet rejected them; but I fear very much that her enemies will at length attain their object, viz., to cause her to be removed from the hands of the Earl of Shrewsbury. I will do anything in my power to prevent it."[1]

Six days afterwards, La Mothe wrote again:—

"The examinations are pursued actively without intermission against those who have been thrown into the Tower on suspicion because of the Queen of Scots. I have been told that they have as yet only extracted trifling and unimportant things from their examinations; nevertheless, it is being debated in this Council whether the said lady shall be removed from the hands of the Earl of Shrewsbury, or whether he shall be ordered to observe her more closely than he has hitherto done."[2]

Again, in a letter dated June 2nd, La Mothe reports a conversation he had had with the Queen of England on the subject of these enquiries. Elizabeth gave him to understand that she was not ill-disposed towards the Queen of Scots, and although the enemies of that lady were able somewhat to hinder her kindly manifestations, they would never be able entirely to break the ties with which God and nature had united them together. Hearing these encouraging words, La Mothe at once wrote a line of comfort to the prisoner at Sheffield, advising her not to discontinue her letters and gifts, for he hoped that the present severity, like those that had preceded it, would gradually subside.[3]

On the 19th July, the storm was visibly abating. La Mothe found Elizabeth on the point of sending one of her people to the Queen of Scots with a present, and a proposal that she should bear the

[1] *Teulet's* La Mothe, v. 6, p. 427. [2] *Teulet's* La Mothe, v. 6, p. 429.
[3] *Teulet's* La Mothe, v. 6, p. 441.

expense of her table and her domestic servants out of her dowry. "I do not know how they will arrange matters," adds the Ambassador, "but I am very glad to see them on better terms than they were."[1]

This was one of those tides in the affairs of the captive that so often ebbed and flowed. Sometimes Elizabeth was all suspicion, and Shrewsbury all rigour; again Elizabeth wavered in her resolutions, and harboured kindly feelings towards her relative, and Shrewsbury, adapting himself to the humour of the hour, relaxed some of those more offensive precautions that so galled the Queen of Scots. Yet amidst all this fickleness the Earl never forgot to take every effectual means to prevent escape.

As the French Court cooled in its attachment to Mary Stuart, and strengthened the bonds uniting it with England, the Queen of Scots became more than ever anxious to enlist the interest of Spain. Philip was very ready to express great concern in her cause, and to talk of his desire to do something for her deliverance from the torments and afflictions which she endured with such "fortitude and constancy;"[2] but he was slow to put his resolutions in action. The Spanish Ambassador in Paris, and the Secretary of Legation there, formed an unfavourable opinion of the representatives of Mary Stuart, who importuned them for assistance. Don Diego de Zuniga remarked, of the Archbishop of Glasgow:—

"The said Ambassador is a most excellent man, and although with strong French leanings [*aunque es muy Frances*] because

[1] *Teulet's* La Mothe, v. 6, p. 475.

[2] Philip to Don Diego de Zuniga, Nov. 29, 1574.—*Teulet*, v. 5, p. 123.

their Majesties here have given him plenty to eat,[1] he is notwithstanding very well inclined to the service of your Majesty, considering that his mistress has no other hope of being free except through your Majesty. And it is certain that I never speak with him without his weeping with me to see how little prospect his mistress has of coming out of prison."

The Bishop of Ross, remarked Zuniga, is a great talker, very assiduous at Court, and retails to the Queen-mother all the gossip he can learn. In Zuniga's opinion he was not a man in whom it would be wise to repose the smallest confidence.[2] Secretary Aquilon quite agreed with his chief in the estimate formed of this prelate. The Bishop of Ross might be a virtuous and wise Bishop, he said, but he could not keep a secret, a fault which, in the eyes of a Spanish diplomatist, outweighed every virtue. Further than this, Aquilon was decidedly of opinion that Spain ought to shut the door against English, Scotch, and Irish, who never ceased to hawk their imaginary projects. Their proceedings were useless, for it was clear that the King of Spain could not set foot in England without having France immediately on his hands, just the same as the Catholic King would not permit France to act alone against England. Great mischiefs arose from the comings and goings of these plotters, which had no other result than the injury of the poor Queen of Scots, and of the Catholics, and the augmentation of the suspicions and precautions of the English. He believed it was still necessary to temporise with regard to Mary Stuart, in spite of her critical con-

[1] Literal.—The idiom means "have pensioned him liberally."

[2] Zuniga to Philip, Paris, May 17, 1575.—*Teulet*, v. 5, p. 128.

dition, and before acting, to wait for a better state of things in Flanders.[1] Acting on this very sound advice, which entirely accorded with his own inclinations, Philip spoke fair, but did nothing, and the Bishop of Ross continued to talk.

In a letter to the Cardinal of Guise, brother to the late Cardinal of Lorraine, dated the 6th May, the Queen of Scots once more complains of indisposition, and urges it as an excuse for not having written before. From the rarity of such complaints during the year 1575, we may infer that on the whole Mary's health was at this time better than usual. Prince Labanoff alleges that she visited Buxton in June and July of this year, but there is no evidence in support of the assertion. That Lord Burghley had been to Buxton is made clear by a letter he wrote to Shrewsbury, dated December 24th, in which he alleges, among other reasons for declining an offer of marriage between Edward Talbot, Shrewsbury's fourth son, and Elizabeth Cecil, his youngest daughter, the jealousy of the Queen because of his visit to Buxton. His words are these:—

"My Lord, it is over true, and over much against reason, that upon my being at Buxton last, advantage was sought by some that loved me not, to confirm in her Majesty a former conceit which had been laboured to be put into her head, that I was of late time become friendly to the Queen of Scots, and that I had no disposition to encounter her practices; and now at my being at Buxton, her Majesty did directly conceive that my being there was, by means of your Lordship and my Lady, to enter into intelligence with the Queen of Scots; and hereof at my return to her Majesty's presence I had very sharp reproofs

[1] Aquilon to the Minister of State, Paris, May 5, 1575.—*Teulet*, v. 5, p. 125.

for my going to Buxton, with plain charging of me for favouring the Queen of Scots; and that in so earnest a sort as I never looked for, knowing my integrity to her Majesty; but specially knowing how contrariously the Queen of Scots conceived of me for many things past, to the offence of the Queen of Scots. And yet true it is, I never indeed gave just cause by any private affection of my own, or for myself to offend the Queen of Scots; but whatsoever I did was for the service of mine own sovereign lady, the Queen, which if it were yet again to be done, I would do. . . . As for the Queen of Scots, truly I have no spot of evil meaning to her; neither do I mean to deal with any titles to the crown. If she shall intend any evil to the Queen's Majesty, my sovereign, for her sake I must and will mean to impeach her; and therein I may be her unfriend or worse." [1]

In this letter Burghley clearly refers to a visit he had paid to Buxton, and we know, from a letter of the Recorder Fletewood's, that the Lord Treasurer wrote to him from Buxton on the 6th August.[2] But Burghley makes no mention of the Queen of Scots being there, nor is it likely that she would be. No letters and papers of this year allude to her removal from Sheffield. The suspicion of Elizabeth may have been aroused by Burghley's visit to the neighbourhood of Sheffield, from which Buxton is distant about twenty-eight miles, and it is therefore by no means necessary to resort to the supposition that the imprisoned Queen, and the great Minister, met at the Baths. It was on the 6th August that Burghley wrote from Buxton to Fletewood. On the 30th July, Mary wrote from Sheffield to the Duke de Nevers,[3] and on the 3rd August to Dr. Allan, expressing her intention of restoring the Catholic

[1] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 131. [2] *Wright's* Elizabeth, v, 2, p. 17.
[3] *Gatty's* ed. Hunter's Hallamshire, p. 113.

religion, if ever the opportunity were afforded her.[1] On the 12th September, the Lord Treasurer was again in London.[2] If, therefore, the meeting occurred at all, which we do not believe, it was before July 30th, or after August 3rd.

In the autumn of this year we come across the first traces of three serious causes of annoyance to Shrewsbury, to his family, and to the Queen of Scots. These were the reduction of the Earl's allowance for the Queen's diet, the dissensions that broke out between himself and his family, and the conduct of the French Government in dealing with Mary Stuart's dowry. We have noticed above, a suggestion from Elizabeth, that the Queen of Scots should defray some of her expenses out of her dowry. In September, Mr. Beale, Clerk to the Council, accompanied some commissioners from the French King to Sheffield. The Frenchmen came to induce Mary to exchange her duchy of Touraine for the county of Vermandaise, and lands in the baliwicks of Senley and Vetry, and, being powerless to resist, in the end she submitted to be wronged.[3] Beale's commission was to look after the French Envoys, but he was likewise to inform Shrewsbury that from Michaelmas day his allowance for the Queen's diet would be reduced from £52 to £30 a week. Against the change Shrewsbury energetically protested, but to little purpose; and ever after, this grievance oc-

[1] *Cotton MSS., Calig.* IX., p. 230. [2] *Walsingham's Journal*, p. 64.

[3] The formal ordinance giving effect to the exchange was signed by the King of France on the 31st October, 1576, and was registered by the Parliament of Paris, 27th December, in the same year.

cupies a prominent position in his letters to Elizabeth and her ministers.

The marriage of the Earl of Lennox with Elizabeth Cavendish produced important consequences to the Talbots, by shifting the Countess of Shrewsbury's centre of interest from the family of her husband back to her own children. Until the autumn of 1574, the most splendid matches concluded by Bess of Hardwicke had been those effected in the house of Talbot. Not only had she herself become Countess of Shrewsbury, but her daughter Mary had married Gilbert Talbot; and the Earl's daughter, Grace, had married her eldest son, Henry Cavendish. Her interest, and that of the Talbots, were thus nearly identical. What they sought she sought, and what seemed injurious to them, was deemed injurious by her. In the treatment of the Queen of Scots the Countess of Shrewsbury had been careful so to shape her conduct as to subserve the interest of the family. Shrewsbury was himself true to his sovereign, and full of the most loyal professions. His Countess laid herself out to be accounted a friend of the Queen of Scots, and forwarded her interests in many little ways, the effect of which would have been apparent had Mary succeeded to the throne. The remembrance of these acts of kindness might probably have blotted out the recollection of the Earl's sternness; and even if the worst had happened, and Mary the Queen had avenged the wrongs of Mary the prisoner, by the sacrifice of Shrewsbury's head, there was still a probability that the favours conferred by the

Countess and the Cavendishes might have secured to that family a large share of the Talbot estates. The game was skilfully played. Whatever might happen in the course of providence, was likely to serve the purpose of the ambitious Countess.

But the marriage with Lennox changed the aspect of affairs, and the birth of a daughter to the young couple, afterwards known in history as Lady Arabella Stuart, an event which occurred at Chatsworth, augmented the delight with which Lady Shrewsbury regarded the alliance of her family with royalty. The Talbots no longer occupied the first place in her interested affection, and the accession of the Queen of Scots to the throne ceased to appear to her in any event desirable. Mary and her son were the chief obstacles in the way of Lennox's ambition. The prospect of being mother to a Queen was too intoxicating for Lady Shrewsbury, and with all her characteristic energy she directed her endeavours to the destruction of the Queen of Scots, and the advancement of her new son-in-law. M. de la Mothe had feared that the friendship between the Countesses of Lennox and Shrewsbury would lead both to entertain a common enmity against the Queen of Scots. Its actual effect was a reconciliation between Mary and her mother-in-law, and hostility between Mary and her quondam ally, Lady Shrewsbury. Both these changes became apparent during the autumn of 1575.

Gilbert Talbot, in letters to Lady Shrewsbury, spoke disparagingly of his father's meanness, and

praised her Ladyship's generosity. He expressed great anxiety to get away from Sheffield, saying, "In all my life I never longed for anything so much as to be from hence; truly, Madam, I rather wish myself a plowman than here to continue."[1]

These were but the beginnings of quarrels destined to bear much bitter fruit; while the intercourse between the Queen of Scots and Lady Lennox marked the beginning of a reconciliation. Mary appears to have written graciously to her mother-in-law, and in November, both the Dowager Countess and the young mother of the Lady Arabella wrote in terms of kindness to the Queen of Scots, whom only a year before the Countess Margaret had repudiated as the murderess of her son.[2]

From the commencement of her captivity in England, the Queen of Scots had been in constant communication with Bertrand de Salignac de la Mothe Fénélon, Ambassador of the King of France

[1] *Hallamshire*, Gatty's ed., p. 114.

[2] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. x., No. 71.

The relationship between the families of Lennox and Stuart will be better understood from the annexed pedigree.


James IV. of Scotland. = Margaret, dau. Henry VII. = Archibald Douglas, Earl of Angus.
James V. = Mary of Lorraine.
Margaret Douglas. = Matthew, 4th Earl of Lennox.
Mary Queen of Scots. = Henry, Lord Darnley.
Charles Stuart Earl of Lennox. = Elizabeth Cavendish.
James VI.
Arabella Stuart.

Margaret, Countess of Lennox, was thus both aunt and mother-in-law to Mary Stuart, and first cousin to Elizabeth. Arabella Stuart was first cousin to James VI.

at the Court of Elizabeth. This diplomatist showed himself zealous in her cause, eager to use every opportunity for improving her condition, and Mary Stuart, appreciating his services, extended to him her full confidence. La Mothe was Ambassador from 1568 to 1575. At the commencement of the latter year he pleaded failing health, and solicited his recall; and on the 10th September, Michel de Castelnau de Mauvissière, Baron de Joinville, succeeded to the important post. Mauvissière's mission extended to September, 1585, when he was succeeded by L'Aubespine de Châteauneuf, who was Ambassador at the time of Mary's execution. The ten years of Mauvissière's residence in England were not the most critical in the history of Mary Stuart, but, during the whole time, he was in constant communication with that Queen, and after the distrust arising from strangeness, and from a somewhat discourteous handling of her affairs, had been overcome, Mary reposed every confidence in him, as she had done in his predecessor.[1] The records of his mission are unhappily incomplete, but the documents that remain throw a very interesting light upon transactions grouping themselves around the Queen of Scots.[2]

[1] "The only result of these investigations has been an inconvenience, viz.: that I no longer dare risk this same correspondence, nor can I trust them to any one of this country, still less to M. de Mauvissière, who is regarded by every one as so little obliging, and secret in his words and actions, that I know no one either amongst my friends or among those who are attached to France, who will consent to enter into negotiations with him."—Mary Stuart to Archbishop of Glasgow.—*Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 296.

[2] The official transcript of Mauvissière's despatches formed apparently a collection of four or five large folio volumes, but only one of these remains in the French archives. This volume, which should form the second or third of the collection, is entitled "*Ambassade de la Movissière en Angleterre*, and contains the series of despatches from 4th July, 1578, to 20th June, 1581. Besides these, other despatches exist among the Colbert MS., and in the archives of the family of Esneval.—*Teulet's Relations Politique*, v. 3, p. 2.

CHAPTER XV.

THE year of grace 1576 opened with many perplexing problems unsolved. Elizabeth was distracted with numerous and weighty cares. The French King and his brother, Alençon, were referring their differences to her arbitration. Sir Henry Cobham had just returned with an answer from Spain, where he had been mediating in favour of the Low Countries; and an envoy from the Prince of Orange, along with two of the chief merchants of Flanders, had arrived at Hampton Court, to offer the sovereignty of those States to Elizabeth. "Her Majesty is troubled with these causes, which maketh her very melancholy, and seemeth greatly to be out of quiet," was a remark of Francis Talbot to his father.[1]

The Queen of Scots was complaining of the state of her health.[2] Even Burghley felt himself in some suspicion, because of a lingering jealousy in the mind of the Queen about his visit during the preceding summer to Buxton, and found it needful to act with more than his usual caution, to avoid offence.[3]

[1] Francis Talbot to Shrewsbury, Jan. 4, 1575-6.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 135.

[2] Mary to Duchess de Nemours, Jan. 12.—*Hallamshire*, Gatty's ed., p. 114.

[3] "Before Christmas I had intention to have sent a letter to your Lordship, which herein now I do enclose; but not meaning to hazard it to the common

Perplexity and suspicion do not seem, however, to have affected the actions of Secretary Walsingham. While Burghley was afraid to send a letter, Walsingham did not hesitate to commit a petty theft. During January, several boxes of goods arrived from France for the Queen of Scots. Naturally enough they were opened and examined, but Walsingham, like a fraudulent officer of Customs, abstracted a portion of the contents, and, with charming *naïveté*, informed M. Nau that he found certain hoods which so pleased some ladies of his acquaintance, that he had taken the liberty to detain a couple.[1] To such petty robberies the Queen of Scots had to submit, and, possibly, even affect to delight in the treatment. Walsingham was much too powerful to quarrel with for the sake of a couple of hoods.

Among the other things that reached Mary at this time was a curious watch, perhaps the one she had directed the Archbishop of Glasgow, in a letter of August, 1574, to procure as a present for Mary Seaton; though the description of the one sent scarcely bears out the instruction "*simple et juste*," which Seaton's was to be.[2] However, the Queen

posting, and not knowing of any that might come directly to you, I imagined that some of your own would be here about this time; I did therefore forbear to send it until now: Beseeching your Lordship not to mislike with the delay of answer; for truly I am so wary to enter into suspicion where I neither desire nor mean to deserve, as I would neither thereby harm your Lordship nor minister cause to unfriendly persons to calumniate my actions; which truly have no other foundation but upon the service of God and my prince, without any particular respect of offence against any."—Burghley to Shrewsbury, Jan. 1, 1575-6.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 134.

[1] Walsingham to Nau, Jan. 23.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. x., No. 76.

[2] "The watch I ask for is for Seaton. If you cannot find one ready made, have it made to order, plain and good, according to my first instruction, with the alarum separate."—Mary to Glasgow.—*Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 215.

expressed herself highly pleased with the watch, and admired much its pretty devices.[1]

The letter in which Mary acknowledges the receipt of the watch will be read with interest, even though it has been printed by Miss Strickland, who has curiously missed its whole point, by the mistranslation of a word. We follow the text of Prince Labanoff. The Queen says:—

"I am very fond of my little dogs, but I fear they will be rather large. M. de Mauvissière, Ambassador of the most Christian King, my good brother, has asked me to obtain some water spaniels and blood hounds [*chiens de sang*]. I at once asked the Earl of Shrewsbury to help me, for no one has access here. He has given me three spaniels and two of the others, which he is assured are good ones; but after I had got them, M. de Mauvissière asked me to keep them for a time. Since I know no better means of forwarding them than by my own servants, I send them to you, and pray you try them, and see what they can do, and if they prove to be good ones present them to my cousin of Guise to give to the King, if they are such as he wants; if not, I place them at his disposal; and if he will inform me what kind the King wants, I feel sure the Earl will not refuse to get me some more, to be so well employed. I am

[1] Mary to Archbishop of Glasgow.—*Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 282. There is a rough sketch of the watch in the Public Record Office, and a description of the devices. It is headed, "A diall with a watche wherein upon the cover of the boxe opening over the houres was this figure."

The figures are two nearly oval shapes, one containing moon, sun, and stars, with the inscription, "*sa vertu m' atire.*" The other containing a tree, at the foot of which lies a skull and cross bones, with the inscription, "*Pietas revocabit ab orco.*"

Below. "The hande with the houres." On the face a moon and stars, and a tower, inscribed "*qua cecidere resurgunt.*"

"About the sides of the diall." Eight oval figures, four with designs, four with the arms of France and Scotland. The arms are not drawn. The other designs are (1) A tree on a mound, inscribed "*per vincula crescit;*" (2) a palm tree, "*ponderibus virtus innata resistet;*" (3) a shrub with what looks like a scythe at its root; a city in the background, "*Ut superis visum;*" (4) A grassy looking shrub with three blossoms, "*Fructus calcata dat amplos.*"

"The botome of the Diall." A drawing of an eclipse, inscribed "*Ipsa si[bi] lumen quod invidet aufert.*" Endorsed, "Jan. 23, 1575. Devices about a Diall of the Q. of Scottes."—*MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. x., No. 76.

a prisoner, and can only testify to the beauty of the dogs, for I am not at liberty to go out on horseback nor to the chase."[1]

Parliament met on the 8th February. This was the second Session of Elizabeth's fourth Parliament, the Houses not having been called together for despatch of business since 1572. Mary Stuart and her friends were in great alarm lest some action should be taken prejudicial to her title to the crown. She wrote two earnest letters to Mauvissière, entreating him to speak to the Queen of England, and present her requests. The Ambassador feared such interference would do more harm than good; but still the Queen of Scots was very importunate, and to facilitate his intercession, sent a petticoat and pair of sleeves, of a very rich kind, to present to the Queen as a sample of an entire costume, if she liked it. Thus assailed the reluctant Frenchman undertook the mission, promising the King, his master, to carry out Mary's wishes so judiciously that he hoped no mischief would follow.[2]

Mary's fears, however, were groundless. Parliament was prorogued on the 15th March, after voting a subsidy, and requesting the Queen to marry. But thoughts about the vexed question of succession occupied Elizabeth's mind, as well as that of her rival. Mauvissière was told that at the close of Parliament the Queen charged the Speakers of the two Houses, and the Judges, to tell her upon their allegiance who was the true heir after herself. They answered with

[1] *Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 282. Miss Strickland translates "*recouvrer*" "to accept," instead of "to procure," thus making it appear as if Mauvissière begged the Queen to accept the dogs, instead of begging her to procure them.

[2] Mauvissière to King of France.—*Teulet*, v. 3, p. 3.

some reluctance, that the crown could not be disposed of by will to the wrong of any to whom the laws of nature might give it. Then said the Queen, "who is heir after me?" They answered, that King Henry, her father, had one son and two daughters who had succeeded one after the other, and he had sisters, of whom the eldest ought to be heir after them. To which they say that the Queen quickly answered, "What! the eldest was married in Scotland, and consequently the Queen of Scots should be my heir." They replied, that it seemed so to them. The conference was thereupon cut very short, and the counsellors were dismissed with the remark, that the Queen did not wish to know anything further. A short time afterwards, Elizabeth called to her side the Earl of Leicester and Sir F. Walsingham, and had a long conference with them, the purport of which was known only to those three, for the Lord Treasurer had been ill for nearly a month, and was confined to his bed.[1] Much as the Queen fenced with this question of the succession, her hesitation was not owing to any doubt as to who the real heir was, but to a dread lest the formal settlement of the question should induce the governing families to pay too open court to the rising sun. The title of the Queen of Scots was as clear as that of Elizabeth herself, and would never have been questioned but for the peculiar temperament of the English Queen, and the very perplexing problems arising from differences of religion.

Early in March, the Queen of Scots was removed

[1] Mauvissière to the King of France, April 8.—*Teulet*, v. 3, p. 5.

to Sheffield Manor, otherwise called Sheffield Lodge, and wrote thence thanking Mauvissière for his intercession with the Queen of England, and asking him to obtain permission for her to go to Buxton.[1] Suspicions were, however, as rife as ever, and the desired favour was not granted until June.[2] Meanwhile M. Dolu, Mary's Treasurer and Receiver General, with much difficulty, obtained leave to attend on his mistress at Sheffield, and afford her those explanations about the state of her affairs which she so much wished. He returned to London in the latter part of May, the bearer of very full instructions, which he seems to have been careful never to carry out.

At the end of May, intelligence of the death of the Earl of Bothwell reached the Queen of Scots. This event occurred at the Castle of Malmoe, in Denmark, in October or November 1575, and Mary was informed that before he died Bothwell made ample confession of his sins, and among the rest acknowledged himself to be the murderer of Darnley, while in express terms, and on the damnation of his soul, he declared her innocent. Such testimony the Queen of Scots naturally deemed to be of the utmost importance to her cause, and she charged the Archbishop of Glasgow to try by all means to ascertain the truth of the report.[3] Around this con-

[1] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. x., p. 78.

[2] On the 19th March, 1575-6, Walsingham writes to Shrewsbury, "I am also nowe willed by her Majestie to lett your L. understand that how shee is verie lately, and credibly, enformed of certayne secreat messingers come owt of Scotland with lettres to that Queen, your charge, who are alreadie entred England, and by all likelyhoode not farre from your L' howse; Her Majestie's pleasure, therefore, is that you devyse all the best and secreatest meanes you can, in belaiyinge the countrie rownd abowt you for their apprehension and the interceptynge of the sayd lettres."—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 139.

[3] *Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 330.

fession of Bothwell's, as with so many other important papers relating to the affairs of Mary Stuart, suspicions about its authenticity hang. The original, if any such there were, is not to be found; but we have instead three versions, one in French and two in English, narrating, in the third person, the substance of Bothwell's admissions. The French version was published in the Appendix to Keith's History of the Church of Scotland, from a manuscript preserved in the Scotch College at Paris, which has since perished. The English versions, which profess to be contemporary copies, are preserved among the Cottonian Manuscripts in the British Museum.[1] Both of them speak of the confession as being "maire lang" in Latin and Danish; but there would have been less room for cavil if a document of so much importance had been exactly copied, instead of abridged. Even Prince Labanoff, with all his chivalry for Mary Stuart, is constrained to say:—

"Unfortunately the original of this document no longer exists, and the translations, or rather the extracts from it which we possess, are so vague and wordy that they do not supply elements sufficient to establish their authenticity."[2]

The French version says: "Alors le comte . . . affirma la Reine innocente de la dicte mort."

The English version says: "Im primis, he did take it upon his death, that the Queene never knew nor consented to the death of the Kinge, but he and his friends by his appointment, dyvers lords consenting and subscriving thereunto; whilk yet was not present at the deed dooinge."[3]

[1] *Caligula*, D. II., 519, and *Titus*, C. VII., 39 bis.

[2] *Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 339.

[3] See *Teulet's* Supplement to Labanoff, where the versions are fully set forth.—Pp. 240-245.

These words it will be noticed fall somewhat short of the complete and solemn exculpation of the Queen, to which report at Sheffield had exaggerated them; and it may be that, if we could trace the rumour back to its source by the death-bed of Bothwell, we should find it had grown into importance from a very small beginning. Bothwell's declaration, though it might be valuable evidence against himself, is worthless as an exculpation of the Queen of Scots.

Mauvissière and other French friends of Queen Mary were delighting themselves during the spring of this year with the idea that the long desired interview between the two Queens was about to take place, if not during the ensuing summer, at least in the following year. Such a meeting had been the dream of Mary's life. Soon after her arrival in Scotland, she eagerly assented to a proposal to meet Elizabeth at York, but the interview never took place; and long after her coming to England, entreaties for admission to the presence of the Queen, formed the burden of many a letter. And was this darling wish of her heart to be gratified? The mere hint that such a thing was possible threw the Scotch Queen and her little court into an eager tremulousness of expectation. The hope, faint as it was, was fondly entertained, and M. Nau, in a whisper of suppressed delight, conveyed the joyful tidings to the Archbishop of Glasgow.[1]

[1] In a postscript to a long letter addressed by the Queen of Scots to the Archbishop of Glasgow, dated May 21 and June 1, Nau says: "We have had information very secretly that the Queen of England is thinking of coming this summer to the Baths at Buxton, there to relax herself in disguise, and without the knowledge of her Court, to come and see our Queen at Chatsworth, and communicate with her. I cannot positively assure you of the fact, but her Majesty quite believes it will happen. God can rule all things to a

We may conceive, therefore, the eagerness with which Mary received permission to go to Buxton at the beginning of June, fancying that there, or in its neighbourhood, she might at length meet the Sovereign who so powerfully swayed her destinies. The interview was but a mirage, appearing in the desert of her captivity, to tantalize and disappoint; but the journey to Buxton, which she was permitted to make, afforded a grateful relief to the monotony of her life. The Queen of Scots was removed thither early in June, and at the earnest entreaty of the French Ambassador, was allowed to spend the greater part of June and July in taking the waters and using the baths. It appears to have been intended not to return to Sheffield, but to remove the Queen from Buxton to her old quarters at Tutbury. On the remonstrance of Shrewsbury, however, the design was abandoned.[1]

On the 30th July, Mary was again at Sheffield, and wrote to thank Elizabeth for the number of kind attentions which she had recently received, and informed her of the benefit she had derived from the baths.[2] On the same day, she wrote to the

good and happy end!"—*Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 331. In a despatch, dated 31st May, Mauvissiere, after speaking of the favourable disposition of Elizabeth, says: "I have again been told that the Queen of England is about planning a journey into the country where she [the Queen of Scots] is a prisoner, to see her incidentally; but I think it will not be this year."—*Teulet*, v. 3, p. 9.

[1] Walsingham writing to Shrewsbury on the 27th June, says: "I have this day received your Lordship's letter of the 23rd of this present, and imparted to her Majesty such reasons as you therein allege, to show how unfit a place Tutbury is, as well for the safe custody of your charge, as also for necessary provisions; and she, allowing very well of your said reasons and opinion, notwithstanding her former order given you in that behalf, is now resolved that you conduct that Queen from Buxton back again to your house at Sheffield; whereof, for your satisfaction, and answer to your said letter, she commanded me to give you knowledge."—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 149.

[2] *Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 333.

Duc de Nevers, asking his advice about the affairs of her dowry, in order that she might not suffer any very great loss in the exchange that was being made.[1]

The records of the year then cease. There are neither letters from the Queen of Scots, from the Ambassadors, from the English Ministers, nor from the Earl of Shrewsbury, and we are entirely in the dark as to the mode in which the last five months of 1576 were passed. In December, the young Earl of Lennox died, leaving his only daughter Arabella heiress to his honours, and to more than his misfortunes.

At the commencement of the new year, we find the Queen of Scots engaged in the diversion of match-making. Her old and faithful attendant, Mary Seaton, had smitten with her charms Andrew Beaton, Master of the Household, and his brother, the Archbishop of Glasgow, enlisted on his behalf the powerful advocacy of the Queen of Scots. The young lady was coy, and pleaded a vow as a bar to marriage, but this impediment was made light of by the Queen. There were difficulties too of rank, which it was feared might annoy Seaton's Scotch relations, ever punctilious about the claims of birth; but these also the Queen overruled, declaring herself ready to do all in her power to destroy the force of such an objection. Thus met at every point, Mistress Seaton could only yield to the remonstrances and urgent persuasions of her mistress, and, according to her duty, made up her mind to submit. The vow that stood in the way was to be declared,

[1] *Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 337.

in due ecclesiastical form, null and void, and though the young lady pleaded a preference for the single over the married state, her preferences were held of small account, and the expectant bridegroom himself set out for France, to obtain the desired dispensation.[1]

Beaton was indeed a frequent traveller between Sheffield and Paris, "having a free passport to come and go," and, as Shrewsbury afterwards discovered, he was "the chiefest practiser about the Queen." His "quiet and simple" ways imposed upon the Earl, but after he had gone it was found that he had given nicknames to Shrewsbury and all his household, that he and his companions might talk of whom they pleased and not be understood.[2] On his journeys Beaton sent loving messages to his lady, through the medium of Gilbert Curl, and Shrewsbury expected he would soon be back to his love, unless restrained. This love story was destined, however, to meet with a sad end. In the autumn, Beaton died on his way to Sheffield, and Mistress Seaton was left to mourn alone.[3]

In January, the Queen was removed from Sheffield Castle to Sheffield Lodge, where she continued until her departure for Chatsworth at the end of May. She returned to the Lodge early in July, but during the latter half of the year her letters were dated from her old quarters in Sheffield Castle, save during another short visit to Chatsworth, in September.

[1] Mary to Archbishop of Glasgow.—*Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 341.
[2] Shrewsbury to Walsingham, April 26.—*Caligula*, c. v., 73.
[3] *Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 402.

The English Government was at this time much disquieted by the wild schemes of Don John of Austria, who fancied himself not only able to subdue the Spanish Netherlands, but to conquer England, Scotland, and Ireland, marry the Queen of Scots, and restore the Catholic faith. It does not appear that Mary encouraged his designs; but the knowledge of them, coming to the ears of Elizabeth, caused a renewal of suspicion and augmented watchfulness. The Queen of Scots found her accustomed liberty abridged, and fears of worse treatment were aroused in her mind. The old dread of removal from the hands of Shrewsbury came upon her, and, in case Don John actually effected a landing, she scarcely knew to what extent the severity might go. Fortunately for everybody, these projects were but idle dreams. In the Netherlands Don John gained some successes, but his scheming came to an untimely end, when he died in his tent before Namur, on the 1st October, 1578.

In February, while at Sheffield Lodge, Mary made a will, desiring that, if she died in prison, her body might be conveyed to St. Denis, for interment by the side of her first husband, King Francis II., and she gave particular orders as to the ceremonies to be observed on that occasion. Mary declared her son heir to all her property, to the crown of Scotland, and to her rights to the crown of England, provided that he abandoned the heresy of Calvin, and returned to the fold of the Catholic Church; but if he failed to do this, and continued an obstinate heretic, then she declared the King of Spain her

heir, or any of his family whom he might appoint, with the consent of the Pope. In case her son should die before herself, Mary left the throne of Scotland to the Earl of Lennox, or Lord Claud Hamilton, whichever of them, in the opinion of the Princes of the House of Lorraine, had shown himself most faithful to her, and on condition of the selected one contracting a marriage in the house of Lorraine. To her niece, Arabella Stuart, Mary left the Earldom of Lennox, and to her servants various specific legacies. To her aunt and mother-in-law, Margaret Countess of Lennox, she bequeathed her claims to the Earldom of Angus, and revoked from her natural brother, the Lord Robert Stuart, the grant of the Orkneys, declaring them essential to the interests of the crown.[1] These dispositions are curious rather than important, since they merely indicate the state of the Queen of Scots' feelings towards a number of persons, and thus throw an incidental light on the narrative of her life.

M. du Verger, Chancellor of the Queen of Scots, paid her a visit in April. During the time he was at Sheffield, he and his mistress were daily occupied about the reckoning of her accounts, and Shrewsbury knew not when they would end.[2]

While they were still thus engaged, Shrewsbury received from his wife at Chatsworth an epistle curiously compounded of affection, acquisitiveness, and jealousy. The Countess was anxious for a visit from her husband. She also wanted some timber

[1] *Labanoff*, v, 4, p. 352.

[2] Shrewsbury to Walsingham, April 26.—*Caligula*, c. v., 73.

leading, a present of a ton of iron, and some money, but as none of these things came, she said, "I see it is out of sight out of mind with you." On her part she was specially attentive. She sent lettuce every second day to the Earl and his charge, for she knew that he loved them, and having nothing else to send she begged to be commended to her lord, his "charge and love," and suggested the propriety of his bringing five pieces of the great hangings, and some carpets.[1]

Permission for the desired removal, urged on the plea that the house at Sheffield needed airing, was granted on the 9th May, but it was to be delayed

[1] This letter is printed by *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 167, and has often been partially quoted. It is a very characteristic letter, and reads as follows:—

"My dear heart,—I have sent your letters again, and thank you for them; they require no answer; but, when you write, remember to thank him for them. If you cannot get my timber carried I must be without it, though I greatly want it; but if it would please you to command Herbert, or any other, to move your tenants to bring it, I know they will not deny to do it. I pray you let me know if I shall have the ton of iron. If you cannot spare it, I must make shift to get it elsewhere, for I may not now want it. You promised to send me money afore this time to buy oxen, but I see out of sight out of mind with you.

"My son Gilbert hath been very ill in his head ever since he came from Sheffield; I think it is his old disease. He is now, I thank God, somewhat better, and she very well. I will send you the bill of my wood stuff. I pray you let it be sent to Joe, that he may be sure to receive all: I thank you for taking order for the carriage of it to Hardwick; if you would command, your waggoner might bring it hither, I think it would be safest carried. Here is neither malt nor hops. The malt come last is so very ill and stinking as Hawkes thinks none of my workmen will drink it. Shew this letter to my friend, and then return it. I think you will take no discharge at Sowche's [Zouche's] hands, nor the rest. You may work still in despite of them; the law is on your side. It cannot be but that you shall have the Queen's consent to remove hither; therefore if you would have things in readiness for your provision, you might the sooner come. Come either afore Midsummer or not this year, for any provision you have yet you might have come as well at Easter as at this day. Here is yet no manner of provision more than a little drink, which makes me to think you mind not to come. God send my jewel health. "Your faithful wife, E. SHREWSBURY.

"Saturday morning.

"I have sent you lettuce for that you love them; and every second day some is sent to your charge and you; I have nothing else to send. Let me hear how you, your charge and love doth, and commend me, I pray you. It were well you sent four or five pieces of the great hangings, that they might be put up; and some carpets. I wish you would have things in that readiness that you might come within three or four days after you hear from Court. Write to Baldwin to call on my Lord Treasurer for answer of your letters.

"To my Lord my husband, the Earl of Shrewsbury."

until after the departure of Du Verger, and the absence was to extend over three weeks.[1] It was not, however, until nearly the end of May that Mary was ready to dismiss her Chancellor,[2] and, as soon as he was gone, the removal to Chatsworth took place, Shrewsbury carrying not only the Queen and her attendants, but the great hangings and the carpets, so pressingly asked for by his wife.

The Earl of Leicester at the same time paid a visit to Buxton, and was entertained during his stay in Shrewsbury's mansion. To confer the greater honour on so important a guest, Gilbert Talbot was deputed, in his father's absence, to do the honours of the house.[3] The use of the waters was the alleged object of his visit, but if we may believe the Queen of Scots, and the incidental but concurrent testimony of the Queen of England, he entertained the deeper design of ascertaining the inclinations of the nobility in reference to his marriage with Queen Elizabeth.[4]

[1] Walsingham to Shrewsbury.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. x., No. 82.

[2] Du Verger was the bearer of a letter to the Duchess de Nemours, dated Sheffield, May 26th.—*Strickland*, v. 2, p. 4.

[3] Gilbert Talbot to Shrewsbury.—*Hallamshire*, Gatty's Edition, p. 115.

[4] In a letter to the Archbishop of Glasgow, dated Sheffield Manor, July 12th, the Queen of Scots says: "The principal subject that I have now to write to you, is of Leicester's journey to the Baths of Buxton, where he has been very honourably received by my host Shrewsbury. Many are thereby filled with great jealousy, suspicion, and distrust. For my part, after having sounded, by all the best means that I could, his intentions and chief motive for his journey, I have discovered that he has gone expressly there to ascertain the inclinations of the nobility, in reference to the marriage which he designs to solemnize with this Queen, which everyone considers to have been for a long time secretly contracted between them; and he himself even speaks of it in a manner a little more freely than may perchance be profitable to him. But besides that, knowing well with what difficulty I shall be induced to consent to it, without I derive some great advantages from it, he has sent in all duty to assure me, by a third party, both of the good affection of this Queen towards me and of his own, even for his own sake, in what affects my pretensions to the crown of England. And to please me on this point he has received very ill the Earl of Huntingdon, his brother-in-law, who went to see him, and would not permit him to remain with him beyond half a day. I need not write to

The opinion of Shrewsbury was important in such a calculation, and it was scarcely less important to ascertain the views of the Queen of Scots. Confidential communications accordingly passed between Buxton and Chatsworth, and it would seem from Mary's letter that she had had personal negotiations with an agent of Leicester's. The smooth professions of Leicester failed to overcome the distrust entertained by the Queen of Scots. She never believed in Leicester's promises, and readily saw through the transparent device to draw her into an approval of his ambitious project. Elizabeth on the

you the endless other reports to this purpose that have come to my ear, from which, after all, I can learn nothing, except that the said Lord Leicester wishes to maintain and preserve her favour during this reign, and to have an eye to secure himself for the future; wherein I have determined to give no more faith to his words than his behaviour, full of all dissimulations, allows me ground; and I pray you to inform Morgan, Liggoris, and others, who may in this be alarmed and distrustful. . . . The said Leicester has proposed to me to write in my exculpation to this Queen, and to inform her that I was in nowise sought after by Don Juan, without understanding it to be of her goodwill and consent, counselling me, moreover, to mediate with the Christian princes, that they should all with one accord entreat for my liberty and better treatment, in which at least, he hoped that they might succeed. My answer briefly has been that when the Queen, his mistress, testified by deeds and good treatment her favour towards me, I should strive more and more to satisfy her with the same sincerity which I have always maintained towards her, but that I have been so often deceived in her promises, as when she made me cease hostilities in Scotland, and have found all her chief and intimate servants so evil disposed to the advantage of my affairs, that it was difficult for me to hope for better than in time past; that if the foreign princes had any perception of the wrong and injury that had been done to them, I could neither prevent them, nor greatly assist them, as also that they had taken from me all means of writing to them, and that if this Queen wished as well to me as he and she led me to understand, she could make it apparent to me herself, although the obligation belonged to him exclusively.

"I do not know that I ought to pay attention at all to this conversation; but it seems to me that they wish to gain my good-will, either to defeat this enterprise, induced by the fears that they entertain of it, or to facilitate their marriage. And he, with whom I have had this conference, added that it would be very advisable if I had some agent in London to negotiate faithfully what might occur for my service without making participators in it those who do not wish, and can get rid of it, as it would be very necessary. Which I presume to refer to the French Ambassador, of whom they have lost all opinion. And upon this remember, that when he is removed, you insist upon the King and the gentlemen, my relations, giving him a successor truly Catholic, better instructed and more devoted to his master's service, if they wish him to recover the advantage which they have lost by the insufficiency of the present one; and inform me by the same means whom I can employ as agent, if such a person is granted to me."—*Turnbull*, p. 254.

other hand, fell under the influence of his charms, and at this time seems to have been ridiculously in love. If the nobility, and the Queen of Scots, could have been gained over, it is only too probable that the Queen of England would have sacrificed herself to this unworthy affection.

There exists in the Record Office the draft of a letter in Walsingham's hand, dated June in this year, from the Queen to the Earl and Countess of Shrewsbury, thanking them in the most extravagant language for the entertainment given to Leicester, "not as done unto him but to our own self, reputing him as another our self."[1] As if these

[1] The draft of the letter is preserved in the Record Office, *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. x., No. 84; the letter as really sent is among the *Talbot Papers*, P. 819, printed in *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 154. I give the two versions in parallel columns, following *Lodge's* text for the *Talbot Papers* copy:—

RECORD OFFICE DRAFT.

Right trusty & rt.

Being given to understand from our cousin of Leicester how honourably he was lately received and used by you, our cousin the Countess at Chatsworth, and how his diet is by you both discharged at Buxtons, we should do him great wrong, holding him in that place in our favour which we do, in case we should not let you understand in how thankful sort we accept the same at both your hands —which we do not acknowledge to be done unto him but to our selfes; and therefore do mean to take upon us the debt and to acknowledge you both as creditors, so you can be content to accept us for debtor, wherein is the danger unless you cut off some part of the large allowance of diet you give him, lest otherwise the debt thereby may grow to be so great as we shall not be able to discharge the same, and so become bankrupt; and therefore we think it meet for the saving of our credit to prescribe unto you a proportion of diet which we mean in no case you shall exceed, and that is to allow him by the day

TALBOT PAPERS COPY.

The Queen to the Earl and Countess of Shrewsbury.

By the Queen.

Your most assured loving cousin and sovereign.

Elizabeth R.

Our very good cousins,

Being given to understand from our cousin of Leicester how honourably he was not only lately received by you our cousin the Countess at Chatsworth, and his diet by you both discharged at Buxtons, but also presented with a very rare present, we should do him great wrong (holding him in that place of favour we do) in case we should not let you understand in how thankful sort we accept the same at both your hands, not as done unto him but to our own self, reputing him as another ourself; and, therefore, ye may assure yourselves, that we, taking upon us the debt not as his but our own, will take care accordingly to discharge the same, in such honourable sort as so well-deserving creditors as ye are shall never have cause to think ye have met with an ungrateful debtor.

words were not strong enough to indicate the state of the Queen's feelings, her Majesty appears to have given way to an outburst of undignified merriment, like a hoyden at play, making jokes on the allowance of diet, and recommending on festival days a wren's shoulder for dinner, and a leg of the same for supper. Fortunately for the dignity of the Queen, the draft was modified, and the formal document, as sent to Lord Shrewsbury, though laudatory enough of Leicester, is devoid of buffoonery. That such nonsense can have appeared even in the draft of an official letter, marks a degree of levity only to be accounted for by the lunacy of love; but it gives an insight into the Queen's exuberant hilariousness at the thought that her marriage with Leicester might at length be solemnized.

for his meat two ounces of flesh, referring the quality to yourselves, so as you exceed not the quantity; and for his drink one twentieth part of a pint of wine to comfort his stomach, and as much of St. Anne's sacred water as he lusteth to drink. On festival days, as is fit for a man of his quality, we can be content you shall enlarge his diet by allowing unto him for his dinner the shoulder of a wren, and for his supper a leg of the same, besides his ordinary ounces. The like proportion we mean you shall allow unto our brother of Warwick, saving that we think it meet, in respect that his body is more replete than his brother's, that the wren's leg allowed at supper on festival days be abated; for that light suppers agreeth best with the rules of physic. This order our meaning is you shall inviolably observe, and so you may right well assure yourselves of a most thankful debtor to so well deserving creditors.

Endorsed—"Junii, 1577. M. of her Mates. lres. to the Earl and Countess of Shrewsbury, of thanks for the good usage of my L. of Leic."

In this acknowledgement of new debts we may not forget our old debt, the same being as great as a sovereign can owe to a subject; when, through your loyal and most careful looking to the charge committed to you, both we and our realm enjoy a peaceable government, the best good hap that to any Prince on earth can befal: This good hap then growing from you, ye might think yourselves most unhappy if you served such a Prince as should not be as ready graciously to consider of it, as thankfully to acknowledge the same, whereof ye may make full account, to your comfort, when time shall serve. Given under our signet, at our manor of Greenwich, the 25th day of June, 1577, and in the 19th year of our reign.

Endorsed—"To our right trusty and right well beloved cousin and councillor the Earl of Shrewsbury, and to our right dear and right well-beloved cousin the Countess his wife."

[The words, "Your most assured loving cousin and sovereign, Elizabeth R." are written in the Queen's own hand.]

When Leicester left Buxton it is possible the Queen of Scots may have been taken there, for though she does not herself allude to this visit to the Baths, Nau, in a postscript to the letter of July 12th, from which we have quoted, says, "on my return from Buxton yesterday." Nau may, of course, have been to Buxton without his mistress, and we are the rather strengthened in this conviction by finding that the Earl of Shrewsbury's answer to Elizabeth's letter of thanks, is dated "Sheffield, 4th July." If, therefore, the Earl were at Sheffield, the Queen of Scots was with him; so that we must assume M. Nau speaks for himself alone, and not for his mistress, when he says that he came from Buxton on the 11th.

Shrewsbury caught accurately the spirit of the Queen in replying to her favours. The contemplation of her "own blessed hand writing" made him think his happiness more than any service could merit. He was not likely, he said, to be deceived by the Queen of Scots, and would have her forthcoming at her Majesty's commandment. As to Leicester, he was "the welcomest friend" of all others; and thus the Earl fooled his sovereign to the top of her bent.[1]

Buxton Well, with its growing popularity, was destined this summer to exert its curative powers on a succession of distinguished visitors. Scarcely had Leicester departed, when Burghley arrived. On the 19th July, this statesman intimated to Shrewsbury that he had obtained the Queen's permission to visit Buxton, and begged him to find accom-

[1] Shrewsbury to the Queen, 4th July.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 156.

modation there for himself, Mr. Roger Manners, and Mr. Thomas Cecil.[1] Shrewsbury replied graciously, and on the 23rd, Burghley wrote again expressing himself "greatly bound" by the favour, and intimating that he should set out shortly and make the journey as he might see cause.[2]

Lord Burghley spent the whole or the greater part of August at Buxton, and while there Shrewsbury sent him the plan of a Lodge that he was building. The following is Lord Shrewsbury's letter:

"My Lord, I render you most hearty thanks for your letters yesterday, but I am sorry you found not your self so perfectly well as I wished; but I hope the water is not so much the cause thereof, as is the terribleness of the weather. And for my own part I find some change thereof in the wrist of my hand, which God willing shall not hinder me from visiting of your Lordship very shortly. And in the meantime, I wish your Lordship in all things as to myself, so take leave this v. of August, 1577.

"Your Lordship's most assured, G. SHREWSBURY.

"I have sent Greves a platte of a front of a Lodge that I am now in building, which if it were not for troubling your Lordship, I would wish your advice therein. G. S."[3]

It is not improbable the Lodge here referred to may be the small detached building now standing near the ruins of Sheffield Manor, which seems to have been erected for the more secure and convenient guarding of the Queen of Scots.[4]

Mary Stuart was careful and skilful in adapting her expressions of opinion to the views of the persons to whom they were addressed. Thus on

[1] Burghley to Shrewsbury, July 19.—*Lodge*, v. 2, P. 158.

[2] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 159. [3] *Holograph. Addressed, Endorsed.—Talbot Papers*, P. 837.

[4] See the remarks on Sheffield Manor, p. 152, *ante*.

the 3rd August, she wrote from Sheffield Castle to Dr. William Allen,[1] declaring her zeal for the Catholic faith, and her desire to dedicate her life to the restoration of true religion "in this pore isle;"[2] while on the 22nd of the same month she instructed Andrew Beaton, then about to return from France, to impress upon the Queen of England the perfect resignation of his mistress, and her desire to rest all her hopes on the favour of her dear sister.[3]

The Queen of Scots ever posed as Resignation itself when her words were to be reported to Elizabeth; to her friends, she was the champion of orthodoxy and the hope of the Church. She pleased her Protestant admirers, if any such there were, with stories of her large hearted tolerance; while to

[1] Dr. William Allen, formerly principal of St. Mary's, Oxford, afterwards head of the English seminary at Rheims, was the soul of all the conspiracies against Elizabeth. His zeal and his services were recompensed with the Cardinal's hat, which he received in 1587, from the hands of Pope Sextus V. He died 1594.

[2] "There is no particular joy nor restitution nor advancement on earth that I desire, saving only the relief of the Catholic Church and fortitude thereof, to the universal flourishing and re-establishment of her faith and religion, but specially in this poor isle. To which end if it shall please him to make me serve in anything, I do even now, as I have long afore, dedicate and abandon my life in a thousand more torments, and all I can have in this world thereunto, wishing no greater felicity and consolation than in that quarrel to leave the miseries of this wretched vale."—Mary to Allen.—*Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 375. *Deciphered by Mr. Somers.*

[3] "With regard to yourself personally, I do not know with whom you have associated, nor what of your movements you have allowed to come to their knowledge, but Walsingham has formed a bad opinion of it, if he has not himself invented the story, which he is quite clever enough to do. Keep yourself as quiet, and as much out of sight as possible in passing through England, in order to efface all these impressions, and do not forget to assure the Queen of the resolution that you have always seen me hold, rather to preserve by patience for myself and for my son the right which I claim to this crown after her, than to put it in jeopardy by any rashness, and that all my relations, in accordance with what I have enjoined upon them, entertain the same goodwill towards the welfare of the kingdom and towards her, hoping in course of time for all good treatment on her part towards me, which is the surest means she can have to assure herself of them and of me, rather than by indignities and all the rigours of captivity to force me to undertake and them to execute things which otherwise we should not even think of, seeing that I only ask the preservation of my life, and of my rights in this kingdom."—Mary to Beaton.—*Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 379.

Philip and her Catholic allies she held herself out as the future restorer of England to the bosom of the Church.

We must turn now for a short time from the Queen of Scots, to the Earl of Shrewsbury and his family relations. Shrewsbury and his wife had been for some time growing more and more estranged, and matters had now come to such a pass between them that the Countess found her society no longer agreeable to her husband. Without being able to fix the exact date of a letter from Gilbert Talbot to his mother-in-law, published in Hunter's "Hallamshire,"[1] we can tell with certainty that it was written before August 12th in this year, while the contents of it seem to relate to a state of things subsequent to that which existed when the Countess wrote to the Earl the letter we have previously referred to.[2] It was probably a production of the month of July, 1577. We may readily infer that the Countess was in no amiable mood when she enquired of her husband how his "charge and love" did; but she had not then brought matters to an open rupture, for she was sending presents of lettuce every other day, and inviting the Earl to come to Chatsworth. Wherefore then the change between May and July? May we assume that during the visit to Chatsworth a violent quarrel broke out? Jealousy had lodged its poison in the mind of Lady Shrewsbury, and during the intrigues consequent on the presence of the Queen of Scots and the Earl of Leicester in Derbyshire, some occasion may have

[1] Hallamshire.—*Gatty's* ed., p. 115. [2] *Vide* p. 382, *ante*.

been given for a more than usually violent outburst of temper. Be this as it may, when Gilbert Talbot's letter, written apparently from Sheffield, and dated "Sunday, at 9 of the clock," was sent, the relations of the noble pair were considerably strained. The Countess had withdrawn herself in anger from her Lord's roof, quitting Sheffield the very day he was expected to arrive there. She had been offended because some of her embroiderers were kept out of their beds at the Lodge, by the orders of John Dickenson, the keeper of the wardrobe; and remonstrated with such vehemence that the Earl "was forced to tell her she scolded like one that came from the Banke." There were also complaints of tale-bearing and harsh language. Shrewsbury on his part felt greatly aggrieved, while the Countess was equally ready to plead injury, and with "a grieved mind," argued that her Lord's affection was clean turned to the contrary. "Cruel and bitter speeches" rankled in her memory, and while protesting the tenderest affection, she expressed the belief that her husband was happiest in her absence. Hearing of these sayings the Earl "melted," and if he did not say "he had injured and wronged" her, "yet by his countenance and words it plainly showed the same;" and he further said, "Gilbert, you know the contrary; and how often I have cursed the building at Chatsworth for want of her company." [1]

The differences, from whatever cause arising, gave way before the presence of a common grief.

[1] Gilbert Talbot to Lady Shrewsbury.—Hallamshire, *Gatty's* ed., pp. 115-116.

A son had been born into the family some two years and a half before. The first boy of that generation, the child of Gilbert Talbot, and his wife Mary, daughter of Lady Shrewsbury, he was equally dear to both grand-parents, and was not a little thought of.[1]

In closing the letter we have referred to on the preceding page, Gilbert Talbot speaks of this child, saying, "George rejoiced so greatly yesternight at my Lord's coming home, as I could not have believed if I had not seen it."

At the beginning of August, the Earl paid a flying visit to Worksop and Rufford, leaving the Queen of Scots at Sheffield, but he was only absent two nights. His son Gilbert conveyed the information of this journey to Lady Shrewsbury in a letter dated Thursday, 1st August, and says in a postscript:—

"George is very well, I thank God; he drinketh every day to Lady Grandmother; rideth to her often, but yet within the court; and if he have any spice I tell him Lady Grandmother is come and will see him, which he then will either quickly hide or quickly eat, and then asks where Lady Danmode is?"[2]

This pleasant picture of child life, with its touch so characteristic of the dread inspired by Lady Grandmother, was destined to an early obscuration. The little fellow was seized with illness shortly before supper, on the 11th of August, and died during the night. In their common affliction the Earl and Countess for a time forgot their differences, and Shrewsbury applied for permission to take his

[1] Shrewsbury, in a letter dated Sheffield, 10th Feb., 1574-5, writes to tell Burghley that he is "a grandfather of a jolly boy of my son Gilbert's."—*Hol., Talbot Papers*, P. 719.

[2] Hallamshire, *Gatty's* ed., p. 116.

charge again to Chatsworth.[1] The request was readily granted, and in the first week of September the removal took place.

The month of August had been passed at Sheffield Castle, where one of the Queen's recreations was sitting for her portrait. The work was not quite completed at the end of the month, but the artist had very nearly applied the last touches, and the Queen hoped to be able to send it to her friends in France by the first opportunity that might arise.[2] Most probably the picture was the one now preserved at Hardwick Hall, which, by the kindness of the Duke of Devonshire and the Marquis of Hartington, we have been enabled to reproduce as a frontispiece to this volume. It is known as the

[1] The following are Shrewsbury's letters, written on the occasion of the child's death:—

Shrewsbury to Burghley.

"My very good lord. Where it plesed God of his goodnes yestarnyght, a lyttell befor suppare, to visytte sodenly my derest juell wndar God, next to my sufferen, with mortallyte of syknes, and that it hathe plesed God of his goodnes to take that swete babe from me, he surely was a toward chylde. I thought it rathar by my celfe than by common reeporte you shuld undarstand it from me, that thoo it nyppes me nere, yett the fere I have of God and the dutyfull care to descharge my dute and truste my mystres putes me in, maks me now he is gone to pute away nedeles care and to loke aboute me to that I am putt in trust withall—and, my lord, because I dout my vife vyll show more folly then nede requers, I praye your lordship wryte your lettar to her, vyche I hope vyll gretly reul her. So vyscheynge to your lordship perfitt helth, I take my leve. Sheffield, xij of August, 1577. Your lordship's assured frend,

"G. Shrewsbury."

Add. Endd. "12 Aug., 1577. From the E. of Shrewsburie. Of the deathe of *his daughter.—MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. x., No. 89.

Shrewsbury to Walsingham.

"It hath pleased Almighty God to call to his mercy, my only grandchild, son to Gilbert Talbott my son, which by nature troubleth me. Howbeit I do most willingly obey unto his will who took him, who only lent him me, without grudging thereat; but my wife (although she acknowledge no less) is not so well able to rule her passions, and hath driven herself into such case by her continual weeping, as is like to breed in her further inconvenience." As she is at Chatsworth, I wish to go to her thither, taking my charge with me, about which I ask you to move the Queen. Sheffield, 17 Aug., 1577. *Signed.*

Holograph.—I am driven to use the help of my man, having a pain in my hand.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. x., No. 90.

[2] *Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 390.

Sheffield picture, and bears the date 1578. Mr. George Scharf, F.S.A., Keeper of the National Portrait Gallery, regards this picture as the original from which the Morton, the Hatfield, and others have been painted. He says:—

"There are in existence several pictures of this type, and all of them bearing the same inscription and date. They are on panel, and exhibit precisely the same details of dress and peculiarities of countenance. But they are full length, and represent the Queen standing on a Persian carpet, the pattern of which is drawn without any regard to perspective. The feet are concealed by the long dress. Her left hand hangs down, with the fingers wide spread, touching the end of her rosary. . . . The actual original of these pictures appears to be the Cavendish one, still preserved in Hardwick Hall, and is the property of the Duke of Devonshire. It is the counterpart of the rest, but has on the cross wooden rail of the table in the left hand corner the name of the artist, a French one, thus:

P. OVDRY
PINXIT.

Precisely similar pictures, with the same inscription and date, 1578, on the background, are preserved at Hatfield House (probably intercepted by Burghley), Cobham Hall, the seat of the Lennox family, and at Welbeck, a seat of the Cavendish family. But the name of the artist occurs only on the Hardwick portrait."

Again, speaking of the group of authentic portraits, Mr. Scharf says:—

"In these portraits there are certain distinctive points which they all possess in common. The most remarkable among them is the colour of the eyes. They are decidedly brown, sometimes of a yellowish hue (hazel), but more frequently of an absolute reddish colour, like chestnut, or the paint known to artists as burnt sienna. With this, as seen in pictures of Venetian women, especially by Paris Bordone, the white of the eye assumes a blueish tint. In all these portraits there is a

sharp and almost cunning expression in the eyes. The form of the nostrils is also very peculiar. The lip often has a V like dip in the centre, with a strong depression at the corners, and the lower lip by no means protruding. Her cheek bones are very high, and there is a singular space—especially observable in the monument—between the eyes and ears. The eyebrows are raised and arched, although not strongly defined, and the forehead is lofty and capacious."[1]

Dr. Chalmers also refers to the portraits of the Queen of Scots, in the introduction to his work on her life. He says:—

"It is a point of much less importance, even in the life of such a Queen, to ascertain what were her characteristic features, as a woman. Robertson, the late historian of her reign, professed not to know whether her hair and eyebrows were black or brown; whether her eyes were black or blue; whether her nose were long or short; whether her complexion were fair or dark. In this state of uncertainty, in respect to her characteristic features, the late Earl of Hardwick entertained some doubts whether she had ever been as handsome as flattery had feigned. If his Lordship had founded his opinion on a view of the Hatfield Mary, he might well doubt. The portrait has the features of Mary, but not the youth and beauty, the elegant manners, and captivating address of the Queen of Scots."

To arrive at a portrait to satisfy his ideal, Chalmers entrusted Mr. Pailou, "a very ingenious artist," with a commission to construct a portrait from the different authorities, taking the Morton picture as the basis of his work. In reporting upon what he had done, Mr. Pailou said:—

"I found the same contour that I had obtained from sketches and drawings, the principal difference arising from the characteristic traits of the marble [of the monument in Westminster Abbey] being more strongly marked, than the

[1] Paper by Mr. Scharf.—*Proceedings Soc. Antiq.*, Second Series, v. 7, pp. 58-62.

drawings and prints, which enabled me more accurately to define the true form of the features: The statue discovered also to me," he adds, "two traits, which had not been expressed in any one of the drawings, viz., a small degree of flatness at the point of the nose, and a gentle indentation in the chin. A slight indication, indeed, was given in the French print, as I afterwards observed. From this inspection of the tomb, my picture was considerably advanced by the introduction of these two traits, and by augmenting the prominence of the upper part of the forehead, which appeared in the marble to project very much.

"After this great advance," continues Mr. Pailou, "I examined several pictures of Mary, wherein I saw dark grey eyes, instead of chestnut coloured, and black hair instead of light auburn. The picture at Scots Hall, Fleet Street, is a whole length in black, which we afterwards discovered to have been copied from Lord Salisbury's Mary, at Hatfield; the copyist, however, having lost the likeness, by endeavouring to make the face handsomer than the original.

"I was now carried," continues Mr. Pailou, "to the whole length Mary, in the library at Hatfield. This picture appeared to me to have been painted with a strict attention to the minuteness of nature; and has much more truth than taste. It gives scarcely any idea of the beauty of the personage which it represents; it looks as if the original had been fifty, and has an unpleasant expression of sorrow and dejection: yet, it is the only picture that I have seen of Mary, which then appeared to me to be an original. And the artist seemed to me to have aimed at making the face handsome, by making it very smooth; it, however, gives a very clear and distinct idea of the real form of the features; and was of great use to me, in determining the particular and minute turns of those parts of the face that constitute individuality: This picture, if it were handsome, would be extremely like the figure on the tomb of Mary; as it is, they bear, indeed, mutual testimony of each other's likeness to the original."[1]

[1] *Chalmer's* Life of the Queen of Scots, v. 1, pp. iv.-viii.

M. Nau, the Queen's Secretary, was even at this early stage of his employment giving indications of that high esteem for his own interests that led him, all through his career, to place the welfare of his mistress in the second rank. Rollett, his predecessor, when in health, seemed to forget himself in his zeal for the Queen. M. Nau never for one moment lost sight of the fact that, in his opinion, the most important individual on the face of the earth was M. Nau. His proceedings during this month of August furnish suggestive indications of the bent of his mind. The Queen of Scots, annoyed beyond measure by the manner in which the affairs of her dowry had been mismanaged, resolved to dismiss M. Dolu, her treasurer. Nau at once saw a chance of procuring this lucrative office for his brother, but was anxious to keep his own hand in the matter out of sight. He instructed his brother, therefore, to procure recommendations from the Archbishop of Glasgow, from Chancellor Du Verger, from all the princes of the House of Guise, and if possible from other persons of credit. But he advised him to act cautiously, to be secret; and "when you are talking to any of the King's servants about me," says M. Nau, "always complain of my stay here, and that I am losing in this prison my best years, and the reward of my services, and all hopes of advancement." It was not the interest of the Queen of Scots, but that of M. Nau, that dictated such a communication.[1]

[1] *Caligula*, c. III., 499 and 500. The following is a summary of M. Nau's letters:—

Nau to his brother in France.

"Writes in haste. 'Je n'ay voulu perdre ceste commodite de vous donner advis que la re[ine], d'Escosse . . . du premier office de justice, ou est . . .

More serious matters, however, troubled the minds of Elizabeth and her ministers. The Archbishop of Glasgow had aroused their suspicions by a journey made, as was alleged, for the benefit of his health, but more probably to facilitate secret arrangements. He was supposed to be negotiating either for the removal of the Prince of Scotland into France, for

. . . la somme de 1200 escuz. dont j'ay ung brevet expedie, que je vous envoy [erai par la] premiere despesche en lettres ouvertes, si je ne puis avec ceste cy.' I wish you to ask ± , who will know about the vacancy, to assist me, that the opportunity may not escape me. I daresay you can furnish me with more money, if it is needed, and find out what profit there will be in selling it again. [Write to] the Bishop of Glasgow and the Chancellor Verger, when necessary. I am waiting for the reversion which has been given me '[pour] vous,' of the office of Treasurer, and I hope to overcome all difficulties. You must send me by this secret way 'une petite b[oite], fermee et cachetee,' a pair of bracelets of new fashion of 25 or 30 [crowns], a fine diamond or emerald of 100 crowns, for which you had better go to a lapidary, as you will get it cheaper than from a goldsmith. During these wars such things are being parted with easily. It must be in the shape of a heart or 'triangle parfaict' (equilateral?).

"We are troubled (engarbouillé) by the apprehension of war, among the people here.

"Write to me about Verger's success.

"Sheffield, 6 Aug.

"Have just received two . . . with those of ± , of the month of ×. I thank you 'de la bonne part que m'avez faict de 9. × : 6. $\frac{\text{bien}}{\text{T}}$ hazardez ceste voye.'"

French. A decipher, with some symbols undeciphered, p. 1. About a word at the end of each line lost by mutilation.

Nau to his brother.

"The Queen of Scots, by her last letter to the Bishop of . . . wrote of her displeasure with Dolu about her finances, and her intention of changing him, if she can find some one else fit for the place; and she asked the Bishop for his advice. She now writes that in consequence of the daily complaints of him, she will break with him entirely. You must speak of yourself to the Bishop of Glasgow, and Chancellor Verger for their recommendation. You must also get letters from all the Lords of Guise, the Queen, and other persons of credit, if possible; so that I may not seem to be the author of it. You must act cautiously. I fear all my letters have not been received. Do not fail to mention the receipt of this when you write.

"I remind you of the execution of the brevet which I sent you by the ordinary way.

"Remember the diamond or emerald, and the bracelets, and don't spare money. When you are talking to the King's servants about me, always complain of my stay here, and that I am losing in this prison my best years, and the reward of my services, and all hopes of my advancement in the Court of Parliament, where I was already considerably advanced. I do not wish them to think my fortune better here than it was in France. Be secret, about what concerns us. Sheffield. 31 Aug.

"Take care of our parents in my absence."

French. Decipher, pp. 2. Endorsed 6 and 31 Aug., 1577. From Nau, the Scots' Queen's Secretary, to his brother.¶

the conclusion of a marriage between Don John and Mary Stuart, or to bring about a league between the Queen of Scots, the Pope, the King of France, and the King of Spain.[1] Reports too came from abroad that the Queen of Scots had escaped, and it was inferred that these stories were set afloat by persons who were implicated in some conspiracy for that purpose. Walsingham wrote to Shrewsbury urging the utmost caution, and the Earl replied:—

Thanks for your friendly letters and Flemish news. I have thought good, upon these bruits of this lady's escape from me, to advertise the Queen that my vigilant care for her safety shall never diminish, but always increase, if it were possible. That is all the gain, I hope, that the inventors are like to reap by them. I am not as yet removed with my charge. I desire you to excuse my evil favoured writing to the Queen, by reason of a great ache which has vexed me for a long time in the wrist of my right hand, of which I am as yet scarcely rid, and can write no better.—Sheffield, 2 Sept., [corrected from "last of August,"] 1577.[2] *Signed.*

When Burghley returned to court from Buxton, he found the Council full of perplexity about these rumours; but he somewhat calmed their disquiet, and "was bold to make small account of the news." At the same time, he quite shared the apprehensions of the Queen about danger in the future, and, on the 7th September, conveyed his Sovereign's desire to the Earl of Shrewsbury that he would "continue, or rather increase" his vigilancy. In Burghley's opinion, the Queen of Scots would scarcely be so foolish as to adventure an escape, as it would inevitably lead to an act of Parliament barring her claims

[1] *Labanoff*, v. 4, p. 382.

[2] P. 1. *Add. End.—MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, x., 93.

to the succession, if not to worse consequences. Still he was not inclined to trust too much to this view of the good sense of the Queen of Scots, but preferred to see it supplemented by Lord Shrewsbury's "circumspect looking to her."[1]

It is not clear how long a visit was paid to Chatsworth, during the summer and autumn of 1577, but at all events it did not extend beyond the end of October. At the beginning of November, the Queen of Scots was again in Sheffield, writing to her Ambassador in Paris. Her earnest desire then was to procure the conveyance of her son into France, out of the hands of Morton. For this purpose she would spare no expense, and instructed the Archbishop to leave no stone unturned until the person of the young King was safe in the care of his French relatives.[2] He was also instructed to stimulate the

[1] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 163.—We may here quote a letter from Queen Elizabeth, which, though full of anxiety for the safety of the prisoner, seems to trust more than formerly to Shrewsbury's discretion.

Queen Elizabeth to the Earl of Shrewsbury.

"We hear, from sundry places beyond sea, of bruits sown there that the Queen, your charge, is escaped, and thereby great stirs and troubles fallen out within our realm. These bruits cannot arise but from some intended practice, and we therefore advertise you thereof that you may be more heedful. Therefore, as the Earl of Leicester and the Lord Treasurer have told us, that when they were with you, you told them you might much better warrant her safe keeping if the manner of her keeping and usage were left to your discretion, either in restraining her own person more or less, or in removing such as you suspect to be evil instruments in her own family; we commend your great care, and thank you for it; and we authorise you henceforth to use your own discretion in restraining the Queen, and in removing or restraining her people, whom you suspect to be practicers and instruments. As you have carefully and faithfully used yourself, whereby we and our realm remain in the better quiet, a service of which we make special account; so you will use this further authority in such sort that the bruits given out abroad shall prove vain, and we and our whole realm acknowledge this benefit to proceed of your great and provident care, had in the discharge of the trust committed to you."

Corrected draft, p. 2.

Endd. "1577, 3 Sept. Minute from the Q.'s Mate. to therle of Shereusbury."—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, x., 94.

[2] In a postscript to the long letter in which Mary gives instructions about this matter, she affords an indication of the manner in which she occasionally obliged the Earl of Shrewsbury.

"My Lord of Glasgow—I have received the bed that you have sent to

Pope to activity, by threatening to have nothing more to do with him unless he showed himself a little more generous; while Mary's relations were to be rendered uneasy by a repetition of the story that she was about to be removed into the keeping of Huntingdon or Bedford. The letter giving all these directions fell into the hands of Walsingham, and was carefully deciphered for the information of Elizabeth and her Council. M. Dolu was still acting as Treasurer, and was still abused, M. Nau's cunningly laid schemes to get the treasurership for his brother, having as yet borne no fruit.[1]

me; but inasmuch as Shrewsbury's people had refused it, as he himself has admitted to me, I have not pressed him much to accept it, the more that he has not made any great request for it. I have retained it for my own use, when I am obliged to change by reason of my infirmities. I must, on the earliest opportunity, fulfil my promise by another bed of finer stuff. In the meanwhile, I am requested to procure half-a-dozen great hall candlesticks, which are made at Crotelles. I beg that you will obtain for me the largest, finest, richest, and best made that you can, and send them to me carefully packed, through the medium of M. de Mauvissière, directing them to Nau, as if it were some things wanted in the name of some one of his brother servants, so that they may create no suspicion, and may pass, if possible, as things of no consequence, without being seen at court. Write to me what you shall have paid, in order that I may reimburse you. I commit you evermore to God's keeping. 5th Nov., 1577."—*Turnbull*, p. 262.

[1] The passages to which we have referred are found in a letter dated 6th November. The Queen says:—"For in consequence of the apprehension which they have of the storm, I know that they have already prepared to remove me from the custody of the Earl of Shrewsbury, and from this country, which they say is entirely devoted to me. Have your eye open on it, and do not allow me to be surprised; for sooner than trust my life to the Earl of Huntingdon or the Earl of Bedford, and such others of my enemies, I shall leave no stone unturned, believing that I endanger myself less, and find more security there. . . . Remember to send me by the first opportunity 1500 crowns, as I have written to you, and assure Dolu from me, that if he does not promptly make them forthcoming, whatever excuse he may bring forward, I shall keep my promise to him in revenge for his not keeping his to me. I do not find him the same at Paris as at Sheffield, and to look to it betimes, if I cannot hope from him assistance in my necessity but from my own means, as I know you would willingly have informed me of it, I desire that you will procure for me some honest man of rank, and adequate to this charge, who can advance to me, on entering thereupon, some considerable sum, if I have need of it, and whom necessity cannot constrain to change, after the long patience which I have exercised in regard to the said Dolu, who, when here, being unable to give me satisfaction on some points which I asked of him concerning the management of my finances, was obliged as a general excuse, to confess to me that he had not attended much to it, and had entrusted it to his deputy, both on account of

The English court was filled with anxieties. The superstitious were alarmed by the appearance of a comet that seemed to shine directly over the Castle at Windsor. What could it mean? Unquestionably the Queen of Scots was at the bottom of the phenomenon; and the Queen of England suffered from toothache and pain in her head—sad portents of a coming change. With such a catastrophe impending as the extraction of a royal tooth, what so natural as a fresh persecution of the Catholics? But the Catholics on their side found consolation in the hope that ere long the Queen of Scots might succeed her dear sister and redress their grievances.[1]

Elizabeth had among her courtiers both friends and enemies to the Scottish Queen, and each faction attributed to the other the greatest influence. Mauvissière was haunted with fears of mischief. Much as he had done for the Queen of Scots, little seemed to come of it. Every two or three months a new suspicion arose, by means of those near the Queen of England, who did Mary so many ill turns, and then all had to be begun over again. Moreover, it was neces-

his other duties, and some other occupations which he had had since the death of his wife. You see how I have been served. . . .

"I shall conclude with one point which I require of you, it is on all occasions when you write to me, especially when they shall be of importance, for want of your presence here to consult with you therein, you will write to me freely and fully your advice and counsel to assist me in coming to a more sound decision as it is necessary. If it should happen also, that they should forbid my letters and communications, you can (under the pretext of sending me some books) write in the blanks between the lines (alum appears to me the best, or gall nuts), and although such artifices are so hazardous and so common, they may serve me in extreme need, by the means and conveyance of the carrier of this place, who is not so closely watched as among the other necessaries which he brings me, to be unable to deliver to me secretly whatever may be written to me in this manner, without he himself perceives it: they may use for this, cloth or white taffeta."—*Turnbull*, pp. 263-268.

[1] Mauvissière to Queen Mother.—*Teulet*, v. 3, p. 16.

sary to use extreme caution, otherwise the Queen of Scots would be restricted in her liberty, which at the best was not great, and again be subjected to bad treatment. Leicester was ready with professions of friendship, and Mauvissière consulted him on the receipt of a letter from the King of France, but he found Leicester no longer hopeful of doing much good, now that adverse persuasions, working on the Queen of England, were too many and too powerful for his voice to have much effect.[1] Amid contending influences, it was the turn of suspicion to be uppermost at the end of 1577. Mary's letters to France, the proceedings of Don John, the sinister rumours of rescue and escape, the petty bribes to Shrewsbury, and the curious tales of eaves-droppers at Sheffield, made Elizabeth jealous and angry, and the year closed gloomily both for the captive and the jailer.

[1] Mauvissière to the King of France, Nov. 25.—*Teulet*, v. 3, p. 18.

CHAPTER XVI.

PROSPECTS, political and personal, were not much improved at the opening of the new year. Elizabeth, in self defence, gave encouragement to the rebels in the Low Countries, and Philip's Ambassadors told him very plainly that his best and only safe policy was to retaliate on the Queen of England by inciting the Scotch Lords of Mary's party to revolt against the Regency of Morton.[1] The Queen of Scots, closely watched, and dreading a change of gaolers, pleaded with her relatives in France for friendly interposition. She suffered every way, wanting both money and attendance, and though she protested she had never offended against the Queen of England in word, deed, or thought, probably no one was more conscious than herself of the inaccuracy of the assertion.[2]

At length Elizabeth resolved to endure no more. The resolution which Mary dreaded, and La Mothe deprecated, was taken at last, and formal instructions were prepared in February, directing the Earl of Shrewsbury and Sir Henry Nevill to remove the Queen of Scots from Sheffield to the Earl of Huntingdon's house at Ashby, in Leicestershire. The

[1] De Curiel to Philip.—*Teulet*, v. 5, p. 133.

[2] Mary to the Duke of Guise.—*Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 16.

Sheriffs of the respective counties were called upon to render assistance, and it seemed as if Mary's worst anticipations were at length about to be realized. But Elizabeth wavered again. The friends of the Queen of Scots whispered into her ear. Shrewsbury, learning that mischief was afloat, pleaded earnestly for permission to come to court and clear his reputation; and, when Walsingham asked him what order he had resolved on for the safe custody of the Queen of Scots if his request were granted, Shrewsbury replied by a vigorous protestation of the faithfulness of his service.[1]

[1] The following is Shrewsbury's letter :—

"Shrewsbury to Queen Elizabeth.

"I am informed that there are reports that there is want of due respect to my charge here, and that I am too much at the devotion of this lady, and so the less to be trusted, and that it was considered better to dispose her elsewhere out of my custody, to my dishonour and disgrace. Supposing that these bruits might come to your Majesty in worse part against me, I presume, with your favour, not to excuse myself, but to be cleared thereof by your own just judgment. I pray God for it, upon my knees, your Majesty, my only sovereign lady and mistress, that is the wisest and noblest Queen upon earth, and in all excellent gifts and virtues of body and mind without comparison far above any earthly creature, is the only judge of my true service and loyalty, and so of whatsoever can be said to the contrary against me. To answer somewhat is part of my duty, lest my silence should breed suspicion, but what need I to fear for any disgrace, who have for 9 years served truly and faithfully in this charge, so that none of her confederates or practisers, nor any others, apprehended and examined, could touch me with the least spot of infidelity or want of care. In my absence, I have always given surest order, both with people attending on her, and secretly in places round about, so that she is still forthcoming as she was in doubtful times when the greatest attempts were made for her. She has not been kept by hap or chance, as some have given out, but by continual care and foresight, and sufficient guard. When her liberty was sought, and her case pleaded with sword in hand, herself in force enough as she supposed to achieve her highest enterprise, if any hope had been to her of my inclination that way, I might have had an office at her hand with like reward as the greatest traitor they had, and been offered golden mountains. She was without hope of me, and durst reveal nothing to me. He is not worthy of the benefit of your Majesty's most happy government that inclineth his mind otherwise. A change bringeth nothing but destruction of him that desireth it. Therefore it is my part and [that of] every good Englishman to pray to God we may be preserved from that plague. No practice either by slight means or force, for the escape of my charge, shall avail her. If I do not present her to your Majesty, in proper person, when required, give me the reward of a traitor. I desire humbly that your Majesty will argue your opinion of me, and my true service with those that seek my disgrace.

"Sheffield, 17th March, 1577.[8]

"Thanks for your gracious messages by my son, Gylbard, among others,

The storm blew over, and affairs at Sheffield once more resumed their usual course. There were requests from Mary, and refusals from Elizabeth. The captive wanted money, and news, and amusements. The Queen of England maintained her chronic complaint of the heavy cost to which she was put, and would on no account consent that the embroiderer's wife should have access to the Queen of Scots.[1]

On the 10th of March, the old Countess of Lennox died at Hackney, and was interred in Westminster Abbey, as a member of the royal family. Speaking of this event, the Queen of Scots asserts that the deceased lady had been in very good correspondence with her these five or six years bygone, but the letters proving her assertion have not been found.[2] There was no appearance of amity between these two ladies in 1574, when, as we have already seen, the Countess of Lennox appealed to her own feelings as a mother as the surest protection against the blandishments of the Queen of Scots; but at the end of 1575, she did write in terms of affection to her daughter-in-law.[3] For rather more than two years, therefore, the relations between the Queen of Scots and Lady Lennox had been friendly, but we have only Mary's assertion that they had been so for five or six years.

that I should not credit bruits, but you would be careful of me. Thanks also for your gracious favour to my daughter Lynox and her child. These messages are a great comfort to my wife."—*Hol.*, *p.* 3. *Add. End.*—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. XI., No. 7.

[1] Walsingham to Shrewsbury, May 30.—*MSS. Dom. Eliz.*, XLV., p. 22.

[2] Mary to the Archbishop of Glasgow, May 2.—*Strickland*, v. 2, p. 7.

[3] See page 367 *ante*.

The death of the Countess of Lennox left two claimants for the honours of her house, James VI. and Arabella Stuart. The Queen of Scots at once advised those who were about her son to claim succession to the honours in England, not because she desired him actually to succeed, but rather to testify that neither he nor his mother ought to be treated as foreigners in this country.[1] Queen Elizabeth took the infant Arabella under her own protection, a step very agreeable to the Countess of Shrewsbury, who eagerly sought to advance her grand-child's interests. In Scotland, however, the little lady's prospects were not so well guarded. Morton's power was tottering to its fall, and there was about James a band of hungry nobles ever eager to grasp at stray possessions. The Earldom of Lennox was granted to the Bishop of Caithness, an old and childless man, who acted the not very dignified part of warming pan until it should please Esmé Stuart, Lord D'Aubigny, to sieze, by the king's favour, the honours of his house. This turn of affairs in Scotland evoked from the Earl and Countess of Shrewsbury a vigorous remonstrance,[2] but Esmé Stuart

[1] *Strickland*, v. 2, p. 7.

[2] The following is the letter referred to:—

"The Earl and Countess of Shrewsbury to Leicester,

"I and my wife have received an advertisement from Scotland, from Mr. Bowes, which I send enclosed, showing that the King and Council are determined to defeat 'oure lytt[el] Arbella' of her right to the Earldom of Lennox and Lordship of Darnley. We are both bounden to you for your favourable letters to Mr. Bowes, which have procured his friendly diligence, and we heartily pray you to continue a patron to the infant by intercession with her Majesty. Unless the Queen will write in most earnest sort to the King of Scotland on her little ward's behalf, and command Mr. Bowes to follow the matter effectually, we cannot but be in some despair. We beg you also to write to whomever you think needful, and to Mr. Bowes. The bishop of Katnes (Caithness) to whom the King has granted the Earldom, is an old, sickly man

became Earl of Lennox in spite of them, and the unfortunate Arabella, after a series of trying persecutions, died a lunatic in the Tower, during the reign of her royal cousin, James.

The friends of Mary Stuart abroad were comforting themselves with reports that the Queen of England was ill; that Morton, to avenge himself on the Earls of Athol and Argyll, was engaged in an intrigue with Elizabeth to set the Queen of Scots at liberty; and that if such an event were brought about, an accommodation between mother and son might be effected, at once honourable and advantageous to both.[1]

Vain dreams! Elizabeth was probably never further from setting the captive at liberty than now; nor was she even disposed to show her any indulgence. Mary's intrigues in France and Spain, her dealings with the Pope, Don John, and the Emperor, had aroused suspicions not easily removed. When M. de Gondy, Count of Retz, a gentleman of "great accompte and porte," who appeared at the English court richly bejewelled, applied in the name of the King of France for leave to visit the Queen of Scots, he was denied.[2] Elizabeth regarded him as

without a child; and I think it is done that Daubigny, being in France, and the next heir male, should succeed him. I remember that the Duke of Guise and de De * have written sundry letters to the Scotch Queen, in his behalf, with assurance of his service to her. My wife says the old Lord Lennox told her long ago of Daubigny's seeking to prevent the infant. This I leave to her highness's consideration.

"Mr. Bowes writes that there is some hope of regaining the arrearages of the lands; we will not further seek for so small a matter. Chatsworth, 2 Aug., 1578."

In the Earl's hand. Signed by both the Earl and the Countess. Addressed, Endorsed, p. 2.—*Cotton MSS., Caligula,* C. III., p. 514.

* Illegible.

[1] *Teulet,* v. 5, pp. 149 and 151. [2] *Lodge,* v. 2, p. 169.

an agent of the house of Guise, or a secret mischief maker in the interest of the King of Spain, and though he was too important a personage to be rudely snubbed, he met with what was practically a very bad reception, and was fain to content himself, as best he might, with fair words, good cheer, and a gold chain worth five hundred crowns.[1] So far from being ill, and in danger of her life, Elizabeth was mixing freely with her courtiers, receiving ambassadors, and joking with her intimates in terms of affected delicacy.[2]

Mary was complaining of her hard treatment and want of exercise. The state of her health compelled her to take medicine during the whole month of May, a course of treatment that naturally left her rather weak.[3] But worse than this, her letters to the King of Spain, and to the Dukes of Lorraine and Guise, had fallen into the hands of Elizabeth, exciting her liveliest indignation, and inducing her to threaten extreme rigour, on the subject of the succession, in the next session of parliament. Mary

[1] *Teulet*, v. 5, p. 153.

[2] Gilbert Talbot, writing to his father on the 3rd May, says:—"On May-day I saw her Majesty, and it pleased her to speak to me very graciously. In the morning, about 8 of the clock, I happened to walk in the Tiltyard, under the gallery where her Majesty useth to stand to see the running at tilt; where by chance she was, and, looking out of the window, my eye was full towards her, and she showed to be greatly ashamed thereof, for that she was unready, and in her night-stuff; so when she saw me at after dinner, as she went to walk, she gave me a great fillip on the forehead, and told my Lord Chamberlain, who was next to her, how I had seen her that morning and how ashamed she was. And, after, I presented unto her the remembrance of your Lordship and my Lady's bounden duty and service; and said that you both thought yourselves most bounden to her for her most gracious dealing towards your daughter, my Lady of Lennox, and that you assuredly trusted in the continuance of her favourable goodness to her and her daughter. And she answered that she always found you more thankful than she gave cause; and so without saying anything more thereof, asked of both your healths, and so went on and spake to others."—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 170.

[3] *Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 45.

was to be declared incapable of inheriting the crown, and even her life was represented, to the King of Spain, as not free from danger.[1]

Spain and France were in a state of diplomatic excitement about the affairs of Scotland. Their envoys were flitting to and fro, and despatches were ever passing to their respective courts. The King of Spain was fair in his professions, but he did nothing. The King of France showed himself much more anxious to maintain his hold upon Scotland than to give himself any trouble for the relief of his kinswoman. When Morton was deprived of authority in March, Henry III. played into the hands of Atholl and Argyll, and when, in August, Morton again obtained control of affairs, it was still Henry's object to hold with the winning side. It is not within the scope of our work to follow the details of these intrigues, for their effect on the Queen of Scots was indirect. They found her in prison, and they left her there; nor was her position thought of by sovereigns and statesmen save in so far as it might be used to forward their own ambitious ends.

To Mary, the year was one of little interest and much restriction. She received a visit from M. Du Verger, her Chancellor, in May,[2] and during August and September a sojourn at Chatsworth varied the monotony of her life. Her health was at this time reported to be good, and M. Mauvissière was of opinion that she would be still better if the Queen of England could be induced to lay aside her

[1] *Teulet*, v. 5, p. 153.

[2] Mary to M. d'Humières, May 26.—*Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 41.

suspicions and jealousies.[1] The revival of negotiations for a marriage between Elizabeth and the Duke of Alençon, as it accounted for the coldness of France in Mary's cause, gave that Queen great offence; but both she and King Philip estimated Elizabeth's sincerity at its true value. Philip was satisfied the negotiation was an artifice to gain time;[2] and Mary, speaking of the project, declared it to be a mockery on the part of the Queen of England.[3] For the time, however, it served to prevent any active interposition from France on behalf of the Queen of Scots, and gave Elizabeth another opportunity of dallying with the designs of Catherine de Medici.

Mary herself was more inclined to blame the Pope than the King of Spain for non-intervention. She thought his Holiness might have helped her if he would; but Philip, finding his affairs in Flanders in so unpromising a state, was scarcely likely to give an ear to the Queen of Scots' entreaties. Adhering tenaciously to her rights, Mary declined to purchase indulgence by renouncing her claims to the English crown, though she professed to believe that liberty might any day be hers if she would take such a step.[4] Mary was, however, far from contemplating any renunciation of that kind. The English succession was the dream of her life, and nothing was neglected to smooth the way to that splendid prize. She conciliated Shrewsbury and his Countess by supporting the claims of Arabella Stuart to the

[1] *Teulet*, v. 3, p. 34. [2] *Teulet*, v. 5, p. 168. [3] *Teulet*, v. 5, p. 169.
[4] *Labanoff*, v. 5, 53.

estates and honours of the House of Lennox;[1] she entreated her brother-in-law, the Duke of Alençon, and her cousin, the Duke of Guise, to write to Elizabeth in the most courteous terms, begging for her better treatment; and she asked them also to write to Leicester, and thank him very affectionately for his good offices, since he had always professed to be her secret friend. Nor were they to forget Lord Treasurer Burghley, the two Secretaries of State, nor her host Shrewsbury, whose favour was in the highest degree valuable and important. Mary knew that Elizabeth was more than ordinarily enraged against her, because of her intrigues abroad, and felt the supreme importance of a little French support, if only it could be obtained.[2]

Meanwhile, like many ladies in humbler stations, the Queen of Scots was sorely troubled by her cook. That important functionary, and his wife, sadly disturbed the peace of the household by their want of obedience to orders, their quarrels and their disturbances.

"You would not believe," Mary says to the Archbishop of Glasgow, "the impudence of these low people, and the bullying they have done, retiring from my service when it seemed good to them, and at last wishing to coerce me to discharge old Martin."[3]

[1] "As to M. d'Aubigny, I do not desire that he should be employed or have any charge in the negotiations there, as much because I am not well assured of his disposition towards me, as not to offend, by favouring him, all those who are connected with the little daughter of the last Earl of Lennox, to whom they affirm she ought to be sole heir."—Mary to the Archbishop of Glasgow. —*Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 61.

On the 19th September, 1579, the Queen of Scots signed an order to Thomas Fowler, executor of Margaret, Countess of Lennox, directing him to hand over all jewels committed to his charge for the use of Lady Arabella to "our right well belowed cousines Elizabeth Contess of Shrowsbury."—*Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 105.

[2] Mary to Glasgow, Chatsworth, Sept. 15.—*Labanoff*, v. 5, pp. 52, 67.

[3] *Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 65.

Naturally the Queen of Scots was glad to be delivered from such servants, and possibly the remembrance of her difficulties may induce some modern housekeeper to pause before concluding that in all respects the old days were better than these.

The Queen of Scots was removed from Chatsworth to Sheffield Manor on the 5th October, and the following day wrote a short letter to M. de Mauvissière, urging him to do all in his power to obtain permission for her Treasurer's clerk to visit her, and bring money for her servants' wages, for they, poor things, were, as she pleaded, in great necessity.[1] It is probable that the Queen remained at the Manor during the remainder of the year, occupying the new lodge that Shrewsbury had built. On the 21st November, she wrote a letter, dated "au manoir de Sheffield en Angleterre," to Father Edmond, full of pious resignation, thanking him for salutary counsel and sweet remembrances which had contributed so much to her consolation in captivity.[2]

The English records of 1579 are extremely scanty, but turning to those of France and Spain we find many omissions supplied, and a strong light reflected on the proceedings of Mary Stuart and her friends.

The Queen of Scots opened the year by writing, on the 2nd of January, to the Queen of England, one of those letters full of hollow professions with which she so often tried to deceive the English Govern-

[1] *Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 68. [2] *Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 71.

ment, at the times when her intrigues abroad and at home appeared to be on the eve of bearing fruit. Mary in her prison grew impatient, and fearful of mischance and mismanagement, as she sat helplessly depending on the zeal and intelligence of others. Pacing her chamber, or walking on the leads at Sheffield Manor, could not help her cause, so her pent-up feelings found relief in a little extra hypocrisy, and in giving rein to her natural talent for sarcasm, by making use of the most dutiful expressions towards Elizabeth. At the time this letter was written, the Pope, the King of Spain, the Emperor, and the King of France, besides divers minor princes, both of Germany and Italy, were being urged by every motive likely to influence them, to take up arms in the interest of the Queen of Scots. This, therefore, was a fitting time for Mary to declare to Elizabeth that she had established no secret intelligence with the princes of Christendom, and that any letters produced to prove the contrary were false. She was the person who ought to complain, and not the Queen of England, for her treatment was shocking, although she had done every thing in her power to promote the interests of England, and to gain the good graces of her royal relative. Her negotiation with the Pope, she affirmed, was in no respect prejudicial to England, and as to the King of France, what had Elizabeth to fear from him, seeing they were united by a treaty of alliance? The efforts of the Archbishop of Glasgow, and of her French relatives, to assist her in her great necessity, did not in any way prejudice Elizabeth;

indeed she would gladly abandon all demands on her part if it could be shown in what respect they were likely to prove hurtful to England. Mary Stuart, in short, was entirely devoted to her good sister, and to the prosperity of her realm, and would gladly accept all fair conditions proposed for the purpose of of maintaining peace.[1]

Such were the professions of the Queen of Scots. Let us see how far they agree with her intentions, as understood by her most confidential agents.

The Bishop of Ross had now been a long time in Rome, striving to induce the Pope to do something for his mistress, and this winter he flattered himself that his object was accomplished. Leslie, however, was a fickle, impulsive man, and, though devoted to his Queen, not too discreet. Afflicted with that worst fault of intriguers, a disposition to talk, he passed from person to person, and court to court, weaving plots, and continually letting the cat out of the bag. The Pope, to escape his importunities, pretended to accede to his demands, and, as Leslie alleged, gave him a Brief to serve as a letter of credit, and further undertook to be bound by the promises the Bishop might make in his name. This important document was spoken of but not produced, and the Archbishop of Glasgow, between whom and the Bishop of Ross no love subsisted, suggested to the Spanish Ambassador the desirability of seeing the writing. Apart from the little formality of producing authentic evidence, the story of the Bishop was encouraging enough. He called on the Spanish

[1] *Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 73.

Ambassador in Paris, and said he was authorized by the Pope to offer ten thousand crowns a month towards the expenses of a war, having for its object the re-establishment of the Catholic religion. The Bishop, however, was of opinion that the wisest course would be, for the present, to abstain from violence, and not to commence in England. He would first secure the person of the Prince of Scotland, and place the government of that country in the hands of Atholl and Argyll. Then he would commence a negotiation for the liberty of the Queen of Scots, and in case of refusal take up arms and press close upon the Queen of England. The thing could be done, as he represented it, with wonderful ease. A few troops and a small expense only would be needed, if the Scotch refugees were sent home again; and Philip, by rendering a little assistance at this juncture, would prevent Elizabeth from assuming the offensive. Indeed she would be in a most critical position if, in addition to the action in Scotland, a descent were made upon Ireland.[1] The Bishop himself wrote to the King of Spain relating the success he had met with in appealing to the Emperor and the German Princes, and begging Philip to give his powerful aid to so holy an enterprise.[2]

The Archbishop of Glasgow was at the same time urging Philip to send a special envoy into Scotland to reanimate the drooping spirits of the Catholic party, who were sorely in need of something more substantial than vain promises. He pleaded the

[1] *Teulet*, v. 5, 179. [2] *Teulet*, v. 5, 182.

ease with which the Government might be overthrown, and the Prince carried out of the country, and made skilful use of the marriage negotiations then pending between Elizabeth and the Duke of Alençon, as a motive to stimulate Philip to action.[1]

On the 14th March, the French Ambassador in England regarded this marriage between a Queen of forty-five and a Prince of twenty, as so certain to take place that none but God could hinder it. But even in that hopeful stage of the negotiations, there were incredulous ones who would believe in nothing until they had seen it. The bare possibility, however, alarmed the Scotch and Spanish Ambassadors in Paris. It seemed to them that if the marriage took place the best course for the King of Spain would be to sustain the Prince of Scotland, favour that nation and gain their adherence, and then join them in arms against England. Indeed the Scotch Ambassador went so far as to assert that if the marriage took place, England would, within a year, set foot in Scotland and in the Low Countries.[2] The Archbishop of Glasgow, however, was a man who, in the opinion of the Spanish Ambassador, somewhat lacked penetration, and since Philip, as we have seen, regarded the marriage negotiations as a farce, he was little disturbed by the alarming prospects thus held out to him.

Nor was he more disturbed by the rumours that Elizabeth had been attacked with epilepsy.[3] Nothing seemed to move the cautious and troubled monarch.

[1] *Teulet*, v. 5, pp. 189-191. [2] *Teulet*, v. 5, p. 189. [3] *Teulet*, v. 5, p. 184.

Affairs in his own provinces of Flanders, and in Portugal, were not in a state to encourage him to undertake expeditions either to Scotland or to Ireland, and he very well knew that the stories he heard about the ease with which the enterprise might be accomplished, were the sanguine dreams of enthusiastic plotters.

So much then for the contrast between the professions of Mary Stuart to Elizabeth, and the action taken by confidential agents on her behalf.

We know little of what was passing at Sheffield during the spring of 1579. Gilbert Talbot, who was in London, where his wife was under the care of Mr. Julio, a celebrated physician, wrote frequently to his father, giving him the news of the day, as well as intelligence on family affairs. On the 5th March, he said of Queen Elizabeth, "I have not seen her look better a great while, neither better disposed." This was about a month after the King of Spain had been informed that she suffered from epilepsy. On the 4th April, Gilbert permits us to see something of the way in which matters were made pleasant at court. He informs his father that "Baldwin delivered the ten foders of lead to my Lord Treasurer three days since, the which he took very thankfully; and as I willed him, he did give it very secretly, and I did take no knowledge thereof."[1] This is by no means a solitary instance of Shrewsbury making presents to Burghley, Leicester, and other high officers of state. Frequent mention is made of such transactions in the letters of the period,

[1] Gilbert Talbot to Shrewsbury, April 4, 1579.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 211.

and Gilbert Talbot often took upon himself to suggest the persons whom it was desirable thus to propitiate. On the 15th May, in this year, he adds a postscript to his letter, saying, "I wish that it would please your Lordship to remember my Lord Chancellor with some gift: it would be very well bestowed." [1]

The negotiations for the French marriage were going on very prosperously. M. Simier, the Duke of Alençon's representative, had private conferences with the Queen three or four times a week, "and she is best disposed and pleasantest," says Gilbert Talbot, "when she talketh with him (as by her gestures appeareth) that is possible." [2] In April, the Council was sitting long hours to discuss the question of the princely suitor's coming to England; [3] in May, the Queen's eagerness had somewhat cooled, and the odds were freely laid at three to one against the marriage. [4]

Elizabeth was not, however, as yet ready to break off negotiations; and, as part of her plan of showing

[1] Gilbert Talbot to Shrewsbury, May 15, 1579,—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 218.

[2] Gilbert and Mary Talbot to Shrewsbury, Feb. 13, 1578-9.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 205.

[3] "These five days last past they have sitten in privy council, from 8 of the clock in the morning until dinner time; and presently after dinner, and an hour's conference with her Majesty, to council again, and so till supper time. And all this, as far as I can learn, is about the matter of Monsieur's coming hither, his entertainment here, and what demands are to be made unto him in the treaty of marriage, and such like concerning this; and I can assure your Lordship it is verily thought this marriage will come to pass of a great sort of wise men; yet nevertheless there are divers others, like St. Thomas of Jude, who would not believe till he had both seen and felt."—Gilbert and Mary Talbot to Shrewsbury, April 4, 1579.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 212.

[4] Gilbert Talbot, writing to his father on the 15th May, says: "The secret opinion is now that the matter of Monsieur's coming, and especially the marriage, is grown very cold, and Simier like shortly to go over; and yet I know a man may take a thousand pounds in this town to be bound to pay double so much when Monsieur cometh into England, and treble so much when he marrieth the Queen's majesty, and if he do neither the one nor the other, to gain the thousand pounds clear."—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 217.

deference to France, she made some appearance of ameliorating the condition of the Queen of Scots. On the appeal of M. de Mauvissière, Mary obtained permission to send Nau into Scotland to visit Prince James, and take him some little presents; but as her letter was merely addressed "To my son," without recognizing him as King, the Lords of the Scotch Council declined to permit the messenger to see him. Nau returned discomfited to Chatsworth, where he related to his mistress the story of his wrongs, and wrote an account of them, at full length, to the French Ambassador.[1]

In other respects, also, Mary derived benefit from Elizabeth's anxiety to please the King of France, or at least Mauvissière was induced to believe that she did. The Ambassador, writing to his master, on the 26th July, says:—

"For a year past I have written to your Majesty that upon this proposal of marriage I have not seen anything happen in this kingdom against your alliances and friendships, and even the things which I have requested of the Queen of England in the interest of your alliance with Scotland, and the better treatment of the Queen, your sister-in-law, in her prison, she has often granted me, saying, that in all things that may be agreeable to you, she wished to show you how much she desired to be your good sister and friend: By which the Queen of Scots, your sister-in-law, each day felt herself more content and at ease, and received more comfort from the passport and the permission which I procured for her to send some one to visit her son, the Prince of Scotland, than she had received from any consolation she had had in all her twelve years imprisonment."[2]

[1] Nau to Mauvissière, July 7.—*Teulet*, v. 3, p. 46.

[2] Mauvissière to the King, July 26.—*Teulet*, v. 3, p. 51.

At the beginning of May, Shrewsbury ventured to absent himself for three days from Sheffield. He did not go far from the town, and received intelligence every day how matters were going on, but still his conduct ensured for him a sharp rebuke from Elizabeth.[1] It availed not that George Skargelle, the Earl's servant, reported all "quyet and well," and the Queen "sarvet with her vetteles and welle plesed for thes 11. dayes."[2] The Queen of England held that "the keeper of so great a charge," ought "not to progress far from the care thereof," and she conveyed these ideas to Shrewsbury in unmistakable terms. The Earl humbly apologized, and begged that he might have access to his sovereign's royal presence, a thing he had long "thirsted" after; but his best defence lay in the fact that the lady was still safe and forthcoming at command.

About the middle of June, the Queen of Scots, being rather indisposed, and suffering as she had not done for a long time, from a very bad dry cough, was removed to Chatsworth. She had been expecting Duval, a French physician, to put her through a course of medicine, but as he could not or would not come, she requested her Ambassador in Paris to find another physician who was not "a deceiver."[3] At that time Nau had been gone a fortnight on that journey to Scotland, to which we have previously referred; and when, on the 4th of July, he had but newly returned, Mary found abundant occupation for his pen and her own, in describing the

[1] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 246. [2] *Hallamshire*, Gatty's ed., p. 116.
[3] Mary to the Archbishop of Glasgow, June 24.—*Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 83.

reception he met with from the Scotch lords. The unhappy mother persuaded herself that James was eager to see her messenger, and had nearly convinced his guardians of the propriety of admitting Nau to an audience, when Morton, apprised of the state of affairs, rode in great haste thirty-six miles, and changed the course of their deliberations.[1]

It was natural for a mother to entertain these delusions; perhaps it was not unnatural for James, when arrived at years of discretion, to seek his own ends, and leave his mother to perish, with scarce a remonstrance, to save appearances.

The interest expressed by the King of France for his suffering relative was scarcely less calculating than that of James. He was more anxious to see his brother married to Elizabeth, than to free his sister-in-law from prison. Therefore, while instruct-

[1] Mary to the Archbishop of Glasgow, July 4.—*Labanoff*, v. 5, pp. 89-98.

There is among the *Cotton MSS.*, *Caligula*, c. v., p. 127, an inventory of matters sent to the Queen of Scots on the 21st July, which shows something of her treatment at this juncture. It is as follows:—

"Inventory of accounts, watches, papers, "colletz," and other things put in the box delivered to Jacques de Senlis, valet of the wardrobe of Mary Queen of Scotland, Dowager of France, to be conveyed to her in England:—

1. Copies of the ordinary accounts kept by the Treasurer, for the years 22 and 23, bound in parchment.
2. Account of casual matters, by the Treasurer, for the year 1563.
3. A watch, with alarum *(reveille-matin)* gilded, with a case which cost 48 crowns.
4. Another watch, 15 crowns.
5. Two ruff-bands (?) *(garnitures)* one of "poinct couppe," the other of lace, *(passement)*.
6. Another, of lace.
7. A dozen and a half "delassez, que pendans."
8. Two pounds of starch.
9. A packet of the letters written to her Majesty, with the answer to her instruction.
10. Another packet of letters and supplications from her officers and others.
11. A packet of letters to her domestic officers.
12. Another packet, with the papers concerning the Decree *(arrest)* by which her Majesty must consign 24,000 livres, and another for 3000.
13. A request to the Great Council, for delay of six months on the part of her Majesty, of which only a fortnight has been granted. Her Majesty must answer and declare her will.
14. A packet of papers concerning the Controller, Halley, and others.

Paris, July 21, 1579."—*French. Signed by Du Verger. Endorsed.*

ing Mauvissière to do all in his power for the Queen of Scots, he at the same time admonished him to act with prudent consideration, and to avoid giving the Queen of England any cause for suspicion or jealousy.[1]

The Queen of Scots, finding herself more and more hopelessly betrayed by France, exerted all her eloquence to arouse the tardy King of Spain to action. She obtained from him fair promises, and the most touching expressions of sympathy, but something more was needed, namely, men and money, and these Philip was unwilling to give. Still his help was now her only hope, and the Queen of Scots resolved on making another effort to obtain it. While at Chatsworth, in the summer, she wrote to the Archbishop of Glasgow, instructing him to wait upon the Spanish Ambassador, and say that, despairing of help, and seeing her captivity indefinitely prolonged, his mistress had found herself obliged to lend an ear to the proposals of certain people in England, and that a general rising in that country was imminent.[2] This information, whether true or false, was, as Mary well knew, the most likely to work upon Philip. He was continually excusing his own inaction by pointing to that of the English Catholics. If they would help themselves, Philip professed a readiness to lend assistance, but as long as they held back, he held back; and while one party waited for the other, time slipped away, and before Spain brought her sympathy to the war pitch, the Queen of Scots had perished.

[1] The King to Mauvissière, July 8.—*Teulet*, v. 3, p. 50.
[2] *Teulet*, v. 5, p. 198.

Mary was back again in her old quarters at Sheffield Manor before the 5th September, and, true to her policy of blinding Elizabeth by most friendly professions, wrote both to Walsingham and the Queen, declaring her anxiety to comply with all the wishes of her good sister, and asserting her desire to do anything for her repose and contentment.[1] In a similar tone she wrote to Burghley in November, and if it were possible to forget the admission, made through her Ambassador to Philip, that she had been listening to the traitorous suggestions of certain Englishmen, and expected a general rising in her favour, it would be difficult to withhold sympathy from innocence so freely asseverated.[2]

During the autumn of this year, two events occurred which had some bearing on the position of the Queen of Scots. Esmé Stuart, son of John Stuart, brother of the Earl of Lennox, late Regent of Scotland, arrived in that country as a secret emissary of the Duke of Guise, charged with the task of working Morton's ruin. Being good-looking, and a man of some address, he soon became a great favourite with King James, who created him Earl, and afterwards Duke of Lennox. During the few years of his ascendancy he worked great mischief to English interests in Scotland, carrying out with boldness and skill the hypocritical part he had undertaken to play.

The other event was the arrival, at the end of September, of the Duke of Alençon, on a visit to

[1] *Labanoff*, v. 5, pp. 100 and 102.
[2] Mary to Burghley, Nov. 21.—*Labanoff*, v, 5, p. 112.

the English court, and his departure on the 2nd October. He flattered himself that his visit had forwarded the marriage project, and, hoping for success, left Simier behind to continue the negotiations. Mary, who had good reason to dread the marriage, appears incautiously to have expressed herself against it, and her words were repeated to Elizabeth, who, on her part, complained to Mauvissière. That courteous Ambassador at once informed the Queen of Scots of the stories that were afloat, and she, in a letter dated November 21, denied in most emphatic terms the truth of the report. Its authors, she said, had wickedly and foully lied, and spoken against all truth and conscience, and she appealed to the Earl and Countess of Shrewsbury to give an account of the conversations she had with them about the Duke.[1] It was needful to protest and repudiate, for neither France nor England was at this time disposed to view with favour any opponent of the marriage, and the Queen of Scots could ill afford to incur the hatred of France as an addition to her troubles. Her relatives of the Guise family were, it is true, doing something in her favour, but they could not pass beyond the limits of plotting. Her own schemes were being pushed on with all the activity she could ensure, and, while Mary tried to deceive the English Council into a belief in her entire resignation and devotion to the will of Elizabeth, she was laying her plans to bring the fabric of society about their ears.

[1] Mary to Mauvissière, Nov. 21.—*Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 108.

CHAPTER XVII.

IN a life that was one long continued plot, it is not to easy to say when the plotting was most active; but it may be safely affirmed that the intrigues of the Queen of Scots were never busier than at the beginning of 1580. The negotiations for the marriage between Elizabeth and the Duke of Alençon were still in full course. Esmé Stuart, in the interest of Catholicism and the House of Guise, was playing a part in Scotland for the purpose of overthrowing Morton, and gaining the young King to the Romish Church. Spain, alarmed at the prospect of the Franco-English marriage, was uneasily revolving great projects, and was reported to be arming. Mary Stuart, in her retreat at Sheffield, had come to the conclusion that never had there been such an opportunity as then presented itself for looking to the restoration of her affairs.[1] Her friends offered her the means of escape, but she declined to quit her prison, save as Queen of England, though she well knew that the step might cost her her life.[2] This was no passing expression of feeling, but a firm resolve, repeated not once but twice, after the most mature reflection.

[1] Mary to Archbishop of Glasgow, Jan. 20.—*Turnbull*, p. 281.

[2] De Vargas to Philip, Feb. 13 and 21.—*Teulet*, v. 5, pp. 203 and 209.

With this determination in her mind, the Queen of Scots addressed herself, with her usual zeal and skill, to the accomplishment of her designs. She had three people to deal with, and each required different treatment—the Queen of England, the King of France, and the King of Spain. To Elizabeth, she personated injured innocence, and professed herself ready, in spite of wrongs and suffering, to promote her interests in every respect. With France and Spain her dealings were a little more intricate. Writing to Mauvissière, she assured him that the marriage between the Duke of Alençon and Elizabeth was the one thing she most ardently desired. The English Protestants, she admitted, were strongly opposed to the match, and unless France supported the Queen, Elizabeth would first be ruined, and then Mary herself would be put to death. This position of affairs had at least this advantage in Mary's eyes, that it rendered identical the interests of the two Queens. Their safety now depended upon one another, and both were in extreme peril unless preserved by the marriage of Monsieur, an event by means of which Mary hoped to attain all the grandeur and good fortune in the world. The Queen of Scots also requested Mauvissière to inform the King of France that, although she had been forgotten by the late King in his treaties with the Queen of England, she would, nevertheless, employ all her plans and all her friends, of whom she flattered herself she had a great number in England, for the honour of the Duke of Alençon and the preservation of the Queen of England when they

were married, a consummation which she desired more than her own liberty, because it was calculated to benefit Christendom, to promote the peace of the two Kingdoms, and ensure the safety of the remainder of her life. The Queen of Scots believed that if the people of England were divided into four parts, three and a half of them would desire the marriage, and she recommended the King and his brother to make urgent entreaties to the Queen of England, who was anxious to be pressed, and under such circumstances would find it very difficult to withdraw from the negotiation.[1]

Such was the language held by Mary Stuart towards the King of France, at a time when she affected a resolve only to leave her prison as Queen of England, and when she thought circumstances most favourable for the restoration of her affairs. But her conduct presented another face to other people. The Duke of Guise, whom Mary regarded as her most devoted and faithful relative, was using every effort to detach Alençon from the Prince of Bearn, Condé, and the Huguenots, because he regarded it as a service to God, to the King of Spain, and to Christendom, to free him from the diabolic tricks of Elizabeth and the Prince of Orange, who were trying to gain him over to their side. To the King of Spain, Mary Stuart herself made a direct appeal. Following out her instructions, the Archbishop of Glasgow called on the Spanish Ambassador at Paris, and informed him that the Queen of Scots

[1] Mauvissière to the King, 8th Feb., giving an account of a letter received from the Queen of Scots, which does not appear in Labanoff.—*Teulet*, v. 3, p. 64.

had decided to place herself, her son, and her kingdom in the hands and under the protection of the Catholic King, that he might order all things according to his will and discretion, remove the young prince to Spain, if he chose, find him a wife there, and dispose of him and of the Queen of Scots as he might judge to be right.[1]

This communication, made with the privity of the Duke of Guise, seemed so important to the Spanish Ambassador, that he lost not a moment in transmitting it to the King of Spain. It was to be kept a profound secret, for many obvious reasons. To the mind of De Vargas it appeared to open most enchanting prospects. Affairs in England, he was told, were approaching a crisis, and he believed the agitation was such that the least excitement would throw the whole country into revolution in less than three days. Elizabeth was in alarm because of the Catholics, and the friends of the Queen of Scots; for she well knew the mischief they could do, with the aid of the Scotch, and the support of the King of Spain, when once that Prince was freed from his troubles in Portugal. To the excited imagination of De Vargas, the situation was such as to justify an open defiance of France, who, recognising accomplished facts, would not dare to make any demonstration, fearing lest a worse thing should happen to herself. What a position might not the King of Spain then assume, who, having England and Scotland directly or indirectly at his devotion, need no longer delay the reduction of the States of Flanders

[1] De Vargas to Philip, 13 Feb.—*Teulet*, v. 5, p. 203.

by conquest, and he would soon find himself in a position to give laws to the universe![1]

Thus elated, De Vargas wrote to his master on the 13th February. In the course of a week he received another visit from the Archbishop of Glasgow, repeating, at his mistress's command, the offer previously made, and adding that she adhered to her resolution, after the most mature reflection. To De Vargas the news seemed almost too good to be true, fraught as it was with such immense advantages to all Christendom. But, as Mary's ambassador requested, it must be kept a most profound secret. As yet it was known only to the ambassador of Mary Stuart, to the Duke of Guise, and to himself; and special precautions must be taken to keep it from the knowledge of M. de Saint Gouar.[2]

The cautious Philip was not carried away by the enthusiasm of his representative. He saw no reason to doubt that Mary Stuart was a woman of great courage, much irritated against the court of France, and bent on obtaining vengeance;[3] but he hoped she had seriously reflected on the means of executing her plans. He was actuated by the best feelings towards the Queen of Scots, and would receive the Prince of Scotland in Spain, or any other part of his dominions that might seem best, and treat him as his own son. But he was not prepared to submit himself to the schemes of enthusiasts. De Vargas was ordered to watch carefully all that went on, and neither heedlessly nor lightly to take any part.[4]

[1] De Vargas to Philip, Feb. 13.—*Teulet*, v. 5, p. 204.
[2] De Vargas to Philip, Feb. 21.—*Teulet*, v. 5, p. 209. [3] *Teulet*, v. 5, p. 204.
[4] Reply of Philip to De Vargas.—*Teulet*, v. 5, p. 213.

The profession of Mary Stuart's anxiety for the marriage of Alençon was as acceptable to France as her hostility to it seemed to be to Spain. The King of France wrote to Mauvissière on the 29th February, expressing the delight he felt at hearing of the good offices of the Queen of Scots;[1] and Mauvissière, like De Vargas, delighted himself with pictures of coming greatness. His hopes, however, centered in the marriage, while those of De Vargas were based on the assumption that the negotiations would be broken off. The latter saw in the failure of the marriage treaty a way to universal empire for Spain; the former was convinced that whenever the marriage took place, France would have England and Scotland at her devotion, and could easily counter-work the devices of King Philip.[2]

It was thus that the two leading powers of Europe strove to gain ascendancy, and Mary Stuart used them both in her own way to further her own ends.

She had, however, still another card to play. The marriage might take place, in spite of all that Guise and Spain could do, and in that case she must stand well with the bridegroom. On the 20th January, therefore, in the same letter which spoke of the favourable opportunity for the restoration of her affairs, and directed the Archbishop of Glasgow to execute diligently her instructions about Spain, Mary Stuart also told her representative to make a formal call on the Duke of Alençon, to ascertain his feelings towards her. The Archbishop was to ask him to procure for the captive some more favour-

[1] *Teulet*, v. 3, p. 67. [2] Mauvissière to the King.—*Teulet*, v. 3, p. 69.

able and courteous treatment, and to take care that no wrong was done to her claim on the English succession; and if Alençon manifested any inclination to write to her, the Archbishop was readily to offer to convey his letters.[1]

In this way Mary Stuart prepared herself for any event that might fall out. With France she gained credit as a promoter of the match; with Alençon she endeavoured to be on good terms; with Elizabeth she appeared as one humbly waiting on her pleasure; while in her secret dealings with Spain she sought to hinder the match, and prepared for the contingency of its abandonment.

On the 20th February, the Queen of Scots began to fancy there might be no marriage after all. She understood the negotiation was growing a little cool, and had therefore leisure to write about less important matters. She wished the Archbishop of Glasgow to send her some clothes about the end of the summer, for, being ill provided with such things, she had been obliged to have recourse to the kindness of Madame de Mauvissière to procure material for a gown and a soutane. She told him also that her host, Shrewsbury, had been very unwell for some time, and thought he should not live long, a circumstance that had given rise to anxious endeavours on the part of several noblemen to obtain the charge of her person. Middlemore, a gentleman of Queen Elizabeth's chamber, had four days before visited Sheffield, to learn the state of the house, and should his report lead to any further attempts to get her

[1] *Turnbull*, p. 280.

removed, she prayed the King of France to intercede for her safety.[1]

Following out this idea, the Queen of Scots, a few days later, drew up a series of suggested instructions, to be couched in the name of Henry III., and placed in the hands of any one that it might please him to send into England on her behalf. The envoy, whoever he might be, was first to ask permission to visit the Queen of Scots personally or by proxy, to ascertain particularly the state of her health, the King of France having heard that for two years she had been almost continually ill. He was further to entreat the Queen of England to provide for the expense and ordinary entertainment of the Queen of Scots, a report being afloat that Elizabeth intended to require Mary to maintain herself by means of her dowry. He was also to ask Elizabeth to permit the captive occasionally to take exercise on horseback two miles around the place where she was, since the physicians had judged such exercise to be very necessary for the preservation of her health. He was further to seek permission for Lord Seaton, or some one of equal rank, to attend upon her; and also that the Queen of England would take under her protection the rights of the Queen of Scots to the English succession; to pray for the deliverance of the said Queen from captivity, according to the conditions that had been proposed by her the previous summer; and finally to remonstrate against an invasion of Scotland by English troops, at that time thought to be imminent.[2]

[1] Mary to Glasgow, Feb. 20.—*Turnbull*, p. 283. [2] *Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 127.

The various strings which the Queen of Scots sought to provide for her bow might have proved useful could she have concealed all but one. Unfortunately for her designs, rumours of her dealings with Spain got afloat. It became known in England that attempts were on foot to remove James to France or Spain. Esmé Stuart, Lord D'Aubigny, and the Guise faction preferred France; Mary cast herself without reserve into the arms of Spain, and it was very natural that those who were plotting should be suspicious of each other. It was said that Elizabeth was striving, with the aid of Morton, to get King James into England; and when the young Sovereign, at the council board, ventured to accuse Morton of this design, the Earl expressed a wish that the stories about French plots were as groundless as those about himself.[1] Mendoza, the Spanish Ambassador in London, was so far imposed upon as to repeat to his master a report that the English Council, finding it impossible to get hold of the young King, had commissioned Lord Claude Hamilton to assassinate him;[2] but even Philip, ready as he was to resort to the dagger as a way out of difficulties, would scarcely credit such a story as this, even if De Vargas had not written from Paris to pronounce it utterly incredible. Lord Claude Hamilton was not the man, said the Archbishop of Glasgow, to lend himself to such a scheme.[3]

It was clear, however, the story of the negotiations

[1] *Teulet*, v. 5, p. 215. [2] *Teulet*, v. 5, p. 214.
[3] De Vargas to Philip, April 7.—*Teulet*, v. 5, p. 215.

with Spain was wholly or partially known, and thus any advantage to be derived from them was destroyed. Mary Stuart, therefore, changed front with her habitual promptitude, and decided to become a suppliant to Elizabeth for liberty. This resolution was conveyed to the Archbishop of Glasgow, in a letter of the 6th April, in which Mary explained to him that the isolation of her position, being supported neither by the Princes of Christendom nor by her own subjects, compelled her to make the best terms she could with the Queen of England.[1]

On the 2nd May, the Queen of Scots wrote to Elizabeth and also to the Lords of her council, remonstrating against her harsh treatment and close confinement. To Elizabeth she appealed as her nearest relative, pleaded the obligation under which such a signal act of courtesy as her liberation would place her, and urged the state of her health as a reason why some alleviation of her condition should be no longer delayed.[2] The two letters were entrusted to M. de Mauvissière for delivery, but that diplomatist, doubting the timeliness of the application, had decided to keep them back until he could communicate his views to the Queen of Scots, when Elizabeth forestalled him. Through the information of Shrewsbury, the Queen knew that such

[1] Mary to Glasgow, April 6.—*Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 139.

[2] *Turnbull*, p. 293. In this letter Mary says: "In truth, I think, seeing the great infirmities which I have had for some years, and the state in which I am at present with my health, which cannot much longer support the treatment to which I have been accustomed in time past when younger and stronger, that in a short while death will deliver me from it, if you [Elizabeth] do not prevent it by receiving in time some better reward and advantage from my long captivity. And for the present I entreat you to allow me to go to the baths of Buxton, inasmuch as I have not found here any remedy more efficacious for the complaint in my side, with which I am extremely tormented."

letters had been sent, and, by asking if he had received them, she forced Mauvissière's hand. The courtly minister was thus compelled to admit the fact, and excuse his delay as best he could, urging various considerations likely to influence Elizabeth in favour of her cousin and captive. Mauvissière flattered himself he had played his part well, and that the Queen had received his suggestions favourably. She answered little, except to say that because the Queen of Scots, with her dowry, had given money to banished rebels, she would no longer support and pay for her, but would leave her to keep herself with her own income. This, adds Mauvissière, proceeds from the advice of those who desire and seek to make the Queen of Scots die of vexation.[1]

Mary had been flattered with the idea that she might possibly gain Burghley to her side; "in which event," she says, "I should think that I had made a great conquest."[2] Mauvissière, too, appears to have entertained a similar idea, for in his letter to the French King, dated May 27th, from which we have just quoted, he says:—

"I found the Lord Treasurer for the present to be very favourable towards her, and to hold the counterpoise against those who wish to do her an injury; therefore people say that she is his prisoner, and that it was he who gave the first advice to arrest her in the condition in which she is, so that he is not able freely to confer all the favours that he would like to do; but he assists me very willingly in all things which concern her, and is very disappointed when things do not turn out well."[3]

[1] Mauvissière to the King, May 27.—*Teulet* v. 3, p. 71.
[2] Mary to the Archbishop of Glasgow, March 18.—*Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 137.
[3] *Teulet*, v. 3, p. 74.

Mary's appeals for greater liberty, and for permission to go to Buxton, were supported by her physician, M. de Bourgoing, who wrote that his art could do no more than it had done, and insisted that nothing but freedom would cure her.[1] This letter, as well as those which the Queen of Scots wrote to Queen Elizabeth and to the English Council, remaining unanswered, Mary, who had secured a change from Sheffield Castle to Sheffield Manor, wrote on the 20th May to the Archbishop of Glasgow, directing him to prosecute urgently the negotiation with Spain for the removal of her son. She was in one of her desperate moods. Her health had long been bad, and to aggravate the situation, some little troubles vexed her. Jailheur, a servant of Lord Shrewsbury's who had assisted in carrying her secret correspondence to France, and who had made the best of his opportunities to extort gifts from Mary, from Mauvissière, and from the Archbishop of Glasgow, had been arrested and searched by order of Walsingham. But he was fortunate in con-

[1] Bourgoing to Mauvissière, May 1.—*MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. xi., No. 21. The letter is as follows:

De Burgoing to [the French Ambassador in England.]

"Knowing your affection for my mistress, I write to tell you that her health is as bad as could be. I see nothing that can give hopes of her health but freedom and deliverance from the evils to which she has been so long exposed. We have done all we could to cure her infirmity, but although remedies seem to profit, they can effect no cure while nature is thus overwhelmed. I have done what could be devised, according to my art, both for her whole body and for a pain in the side which perpetually vexes her, but I have not much success. I desire you therefore to obtain permission for her to go to the baths at Buxton, where she has before found relief. If this is refused, she will fall into such langour and such strange affections that it will be impossible to deliver her. The hardness of her side and the swelling increases daily, as her age and weakness increase. Her treatment, both in manner of living and the rigour of her close prison, would be enough to make the strongest person in the world feeble and ill. I protest that if I had known, I would never have undertaken the responsibility of the health of a person of such consequence.—Sheffield, 1 May."

French p. 1. *Endd.*—"Coppie de la lettre du Medecin de la Royne d'Escoce."

cealing two letters from the Archbishop of Glasgow, and, besides those, he had nothing of importance at that time in his possession. After a brief detention, Jailheur obtained his liberty and came to Sheffield, but Shrewsbury forbad him the house, intimating an intention to be served by other persons more competent and capable.

The management of her dowry was also annoying the Queen of Scots. Dolu, her Treasurer; the Archbishop of Glasgow, her Ambassador; and Secretary Nau, were each and all playing for themselves in their own way, and trying to manage their mistress for their own ends. Mary detected their designs, yet was helpless to defeat them, and found small relief in petulant speeches. These matters, and the many other annoyances of her prison life, caused her to long for freedom, and although she had made a merit of rejecting offers to secure her escape, and though she had declared but a short time before that she would never leave her prison save as Queen of England, she was now by no means so exacting as to terms. Writing to the Archbishop of Glasgow concerning her proposals to Elizabeth for liberty, she says :—

"I shall omit no possible means, nor refuse any just condition, to arrive thereat, and in case that I cannot by this mode of agreement, I shall expose myself to the risk of such other invention as may present itself." [1]

When the Queen of Scots was in such a mood as this, it behoved Shrewsbury to look well to watch and ward.

Papal intrigues at this time were making Elizabeth

[1] *Turnbull*, p. 298.

and her ministers suspicious and uneasy. Parsons and Campian, two Jesuits from the English College at Rome, were about arriving in England at the head of a Catholic mission, to spread the faith and destroy the Queen; and Elizabeth very naturally interested herself to discover the connection between this effort and the designs of the Queen of Scots. Lord Talbot, who visited his father at Sheffield in May, was eagerly questioned by the Queen on his return to Court, but he reported all things in their usual state, and said he had not seen the Queen of Scots for many years.[1] He found the Queen's Majesty "greatly troubled, and the matter of Monsieur in great suspense."

In Scotland, the intrigues about the young King continued, with varying success to the parties of D'Aubigny and Morton. In April, James had accused Morton of plotting against him. In May, as De Vargas informed Philip, Morton was in greater credit than ever, and had been declared innocent by the mouth of the King's heralds. The attempt to carry off James, on which Mary had set her heart, was not abandoned, and the Archbishop of Glasgow informed De Vargas that arrangements were being made to remove the King to Dumbarton, and thence carry him out of the country, with his own knowledge and consent.[2]

[1] Francis Talbot to the Earl of Shrewsbury, dated Savoy, 29th May, 1580. "May it please your Lordship, upon my first coming to Court, in speech with her Majesty, she asked for your Lordship, and after I had done your duty to her, she asked me where I saw your Lordship and your charge. For your Lordship I told her I attended of you at Sheffield, to know your pleasure; and your Lordship came to a house which you were a building, and there I took my leave of your lordship, and you returned to your charge; but as for the Queen of Scots, I had not seen [her for] many years."—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 226.

[2] De Vargas to Philip, May 31.—*Teulet*, v. 5, p. 220.

Mary continued her correspondence with activity, is spite of the illness of her secretary. The discharge of Jailheur from Shrewsbury's service placed no bar to her communications, for her efforts to suborn his successor were doubtless successful. She wrote to the Archbishop of Glasgow on the 12th June, entreating him to procure from the French King a special envoy to support her application for liberty, and, from the Dukes of Alençon and Guise, letters to the same purpose, written to Elizabeth and the principal members of her Council.[1] To Elizabeth she wrote on the 21st June, protesting in strong terms against the injustice of the suspicions entertained against her, and declaring her entire devotion to the interests of Elizabeth and of England.[2]

On the 24th July, from the Manor at Sheffield, Mary wrote to the Archbishop of Glasgow, approving of his zeal in the negotiations, especially those with Spain; and she entrusted to his hands two distinct and somewhat delicate matters. With the Spanish Ambassador he was to continue his dealings to secure a marriage for James with a Spanish princess. This was to be managed so as to avoid exciting the suspicion of France, and without the knowledge of M. D'Aubigny. The archbishop was instructed to sound James, through Lord Ogilvy, as to the marriage, representing the proposal as having come from Spain, and keeping Mary's name quite out of the matter. On the other hand, D'Aubigny was to be employed in promoting a marriage for James, which had been suggested by Catherine de

[1] *Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 162. [2] *Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 167.

Medici, with a princess of the House of Lorraine; and both were to be kept in the belief that only one marriage negotiation was on foot. Mary Stuart's great reliance was, however, upon Spain. She had long distrusted, and now thoroughly disbelieved the professions of France. The King, since his accession, had contented himself with empty words, and had shamefully pilfered her dowry, and now he was playing more than ever into the hands of Elizabeth. But if France was perfidious, Spain was terribly slow. Philip contented himself with cautious answers to Mary's pressing demands. Very civilly did he receive her advances, but very tardy was he to prove his sincerity by action. To the prisoner, his deliberation seemed cruel. She pined, and he meditated. Could he not be spurred to definite action? Would he not say to what expense he was prepared to go? Could he be induced to send an agent into Scotland, with written instructions and letters to those who might be named to him? Mary was thankful for his expressions of good will, and desired to make the utmost use of them, but she wanted more, and for the time failed to obtain it.[1]

Shrewsbury too had his grievances. In January, one Charles Wharton happened to be brought before him and searched, in pursuance of the orders to keep strict watch and ward. To the Earl's amazement, a lease of some parcels of land hard adjoining Sheffield Castle was found upon him, land which had been in the hands of the Talbots two hundred years or more, and yet it had been leased in some

[1] Mary to Glasgow, July 24.—*Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 172.

underhand way to one Constable, who had transferred it for £7. 10s., to "one Lees, well known in all these parts to be a very busy and unquiet person;" and Lees had contrived to include in the lease some of Shrewsbury's land, and pretended that he had a grant of the fee simple. If such a transaction was to stand, Shrewsbury felt he could not account himself sure of any land he had.

"Let me request you," he says to Burghley, in a letter dated 25th January, 1579-80, "to inform me how and by what means her Majesty is entitled, and who were appointed commissioners; for I do not think this has orderly passed either by commission or verdict. Lees knows no lawful and upright mean could serve his turn, or help his wicked practice. I do not doubt you will call these proceedings in again, that they be not precedents which may hereafter be prejudicial to my inheritance."[1]

The question of the allowance for the Queen of Scots' maintenance also gave the Earl much trouble. The day after writing to Burghley about the lease to Lees, Shrewsbury wrote to Leicester entreating his influence with the Queen, because he understood "her Majesty beginneth to renew again her misliking of the allowance of the Scottish Queen's diet." Double the allowance would not pay him, he said, and yet even this inadequate sum was paid grudgingly and irregularly.[2] In the same strain Shrewsbury wrote to the Queen herself in March, but with not much effect, for Thomas Baldwin, his agent in London, writing during the summer, said, "The bill for the diet money is not assigned, therefore I pray you to write, for great be my wants.[3]

[1] *Talbot Papers*, P. 1005. [2] *Hallamshire*, Gatty's ed., p. 105.
[3] Baldwin to Shrewsbury.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 231.

Shrewsbury did write. He appealed to Burghley to help him; to think of his many charges, besides his "cark and care;" and to relieve him of the fear he had that the withholding of the money implied some doubt of his service on the part of her Majesty.[1] His appeal was successful, and the difficulty was once more tided over; but in acknowledging his obligation to Lord Burghley, Shrewsbury availed himself of the opportunity to enlarge upon his grievances, detailing the heavy charges to which he was put "in the keeping of this woman," and the inadequacy of his reward, saying,

"I do not know what account is made of my charges sustained in the keeping of this woman, but assuredly the very charge of victual of my whole household, with the entertainment I do give to my household servants, is not defrayed with the allowance I have from her Majesty; besides the which I dare be bold to say the wine, spice, and the fuel that is spent in my house yearly, being valued, cometh not under one thousand pounds by the year: Also the loss of plate, the buying of pewter, and all manner of household stuff, which by them is exceedingly spoiled, and wilfully wasted, standeth me in one thousand pounds by the year: Moreover, the annuities I have given to my servants, to the end to be more faithfully served by them, and to prevent any corruption that by want they might be provoked unto, cometh to above £400 by the year; yet do I not reckon the charges to all those soldiers I keep, over that which her Majesty doth allow for them, which being but 6d. a day, may be well considered that men in household, being employed in such painful and careful service, will not be so entertained. I do leave out an infinite number of other hidden charges which I am driven unto by keeping this woman, for [fear of] troubling you over long; but I do trust that her Majesty, of her own consideration, will so well think of these

[1] Shrewsbury to Burghley, July 9.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 236.

things that she will not abridge anything of that which she hath hitherto allowed. I have in these eleven years service of this charge, not pestered her Majesty with any suits, neither have I lamented the heavy burthen my mind hath borne in providing for her safety, and that my body hath sustained (being thereby weakened), only for that I do reckon myself happy and fortunate in living to do her Majesty true and loyal service. Her Majesty, of her gracious goodness, did grant unto my Lord Scrope in fee farm, for his half year's service, £80 by year; and that her Majesty should now, after my eleven years' service (in which time she hath been kept in no less safety than before, although there hath been many and dangerous attempts) no otherwise recompense me but by abating the allowance that hitherunto I have had, the world must needs think that either my deserts have been very small, or else her Majesty doth make very small account of me, the which she, in her princely nature, I assuredly hope will never do."[1]

Elizabeth was at this time excessively suspicious, and not altogether without reason. Besides the Jesuit mission, she doubtless heard through her spies of the friendly relations subsisting between Mary and the Shrewsbury family. She was probably aware that the Queen of Scots was standing godmother to a daughter of Gilbert Talbot's, and had written to the Archbishop of Glasgow, with her own hand, requesting him to send her, as a christening present, a "martre double," with the head, collar, and feet of gold, enriched with various stones of the value of four or five hundred crowns; or if that could not be ready in time, a night-cap band, collar, gold chain and bracelets enriched with stones of the same value.[2] When, therefore, Shrewsbury applied for permission to remove his charge to

[1] Shrewsbury to Burghley, July 25.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 237.
[2] Mary to Glasgow, June 12.—*Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 166.

Chatsworth and Buxton, the Queen was found "resolutely bent against it." The suggestion seemed so much like an echo of the request already made by the Queen of Scots and her physician, that Elizabeth could not doubt that Mary had had some hand in influencing the Earl's opinion. Hence she "greatly misliked" the idea, and did not fail to convey her views on the subject to Shrewsbury.[1] Elizabeth did not like his daughter lying in childbed so near, and fancied, from the incident of Mary acting as godmother, that there might be more friendship between the young Talbots and the Queen of Scots than was quite well for the safety of the prisoner. Elizabeth therefore took the extreme step of objecting to the resort of the Earl's children to the house where the Queen of Scots might be, to Shrewsbury's "great grief," who prayed that he might have liberty to go to Chatsworth to sweeten his house, and that his children might come to him with her Majesty's favour, without offence or misliking.[2]

[1] Thomas Baldwin, writing to Shrewsbury from London, on the 1st July, says: "I have delivered my lady's letters unto the Lady Burghley, who doth yield so good speeches as she did heretofore, which in my late letter I did signify unto you, and sithence that time she did deal with my lord, her husband, for that cause, who did declare unto her that the Queen's Majesty was unwilling of that journey, and that his lordship had so advertised you by his own letter; and for my better satisfaction, she procured my lord to utter his mind therein, which was in substance following: That he had moved her Majesty, whom he found resolutely bent against the going to Chatsworth; and by reason of the busy affairs wherewith she is troubled, as also by her sickness, the opportunity doth not serve thither to proceed any further on that behalf, which he would very willingly do; howbeit he gave me this advertisement, that if her Majesty should perceive that either your honour or my lady were earnest suitors to obtain licence, she would conceive a mislike of you for the same, and so did wish me to let you understand. My Lady Burghley would write unto my lady, but she commandeth me to signify that her eyes do somewhat fail her. She doth send her most hearty commendations, and doth desire her ladyship to use her service in what she shall need; and doth affirm that she will be painful and careful to accomplish her request, and that there shall be nothing defective on her part; and so did desire my lady to think both of her and of my lord her husband."—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 234.

[2] Shrewsbury to Burghley.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 246.

Shrewsbury's expressions of deference to his sovereign's will, and explanations of his motives, removed Elizabeth's hesitation, and on the 26th July, he was able to say to Lord Burghley, "This day I go with my charge to Buxton's well."

The commencement of the journey was, however, marred by an unfortunate accident. As the Queen of Scots was mounting her horse at Sheffield, the animal shied, or the attendants were unskilful; at all events the Queen fell backwards on the steps before the door, and so hurt herself that she felt the effects for several weeks.[1] She was able, however, to travel to Buxton, and reached that place on the 28th July. Shrewsbury's precautions for safe keeping and seclusion were very strict, yet not strict enough to save him from a reminder from Elizabeth. Mary neither saw nor was seen by any but her own people and those specially appointed to attend her. Not so much as a beggar was allowed to be in Buxton; and during the time the Queen was there, though she took the baths regularly, she only once came out of doors, and that was one evening when she walked for a short time in the close about the house to take the air. Even then no strangers saw her, none but Shrewsbury's own people. Her servants never stirred from the house without Shrews-

[1] Shrewsbury, in describing the accident to Burghley, in a letter of August 9th, says: "She had a hard beginning of her journey; for when she should have taken her horse he started aside, and therewith she fell, and hurt her back, which she still complains of, notwithstanding she applies the bath once or twice a day."—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 239. Mary in a letter to the Archbishop of Glasgow, dated the 10th August, says: "As ill luck would have it, at Sheffield, those who were assisting me to mount my horse, let me fall backwards on the steps of the door, from which I received so violent a blow on the spine, that for some days I have not been able to hold myself upright. I hope, however, with the good remedies which I have employed, to be quite well before I leave this place."—*Strickland*, v. 2, p. 20.

bury's leave, and then no further than the close of the Well, guarded by soldiers. Indeed, adds Shrewsbury, "I have not suffered the simplest of them for these seven years to walk abroad, nor stir out of doors, except with a guard."[1]

In an undated letter, apparently belonging to this year, Shrewsbury says:—

"And touching the doubtfulness her Majesty should have of me, in giving the Scots Queen liberty to be seen and saluted, surely my lord, the reporters thereof to her Majesty hath done me great wrong. Indeed, at her first being there, there happened a poor lame cripple to be in the town . . . unknown to all my people that guarded the place; and when she heard that there was women in the . . . she desired some good gentlewoman to give her a smoke [*i.e.*, smock or chemise]; whereupon they put one of their smokes out of a hole in the wall to her; and so soon as it came to my knowledge, I was both offended with her and my people for taking any letters unto her; and after that time I took such order as no poor people came unto the house during that time; neither, at the second time, was there any stranger at Buxtons, but my own people, that saw her, for that I gave such charge to the country about, none should come in to behold her."[2]

Notwithstanding this seclusion, the change proved beneficial in relieving the pain in the Queen of Scots' side, of which she so often complained. A peculiar sickness, however, visited most of her people. A kind of epidemic was this summer raging in the country, which, for lack of a better name, the people called the new sickness. In his letter to Shrewsbury dated the 1st July, Thomas Baldwin says that

[1] Shrewsbury to Burghley Aug. 9.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 239. Shrewsbury to Burghley, Aug. 16.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. xi., No. 28.

[2] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 247.

Queen Elizabeth had been ill, but was then recovered. Describing the "new strange sickness," he says:—

"It doth grieve men in the head, and with a stitch over the stomach. Few do die thereof, yet many are infected. I do hear it credibly reported that forty students of Lincoln's Inn were taken with the said malady within the space of twenty-four hours. At the court the Lady Lincoln, the Lady Howard, the Lady Stafford, the Lady Leighton, are at this instant troubled therewithal. The Lord Lumley is sick there, and many of the inferior sort."[1]

A malady of this kind broke out in Buxton, and laid low most of the attendants of the Queen of Scots, but she herself escaped.[2] All, however, were better by the 10th of August, and the Queen was able to report that the disease had been much more severe among the natives than among the members of her household.[3]

It had been Shrewsbury's intention to break the homeward journey at Chatsworth, because of the injury to the Queen's back; but on the 16th August he found her so much better, that he altered his purpose, and resolved to return direct to Sheffield on the following day.[4] Mary's spirits and health were both the better for the change, and Mauvissière informed his master that she had returned from the baths "very well and hearty."[5]

[1] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 233.

[2] Shrewsbury to Burghley, Buxton, August 9.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 239.

[3] Mary to Glasgow.—*Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 99, where the letter is erroneously dated, 1579. Mary calls the disease "coquelusche," which means whooping-cough. Was it influenza?

[4] Shrewsbury to Burghley, Aug. 16.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. xi., No. 28.

[5] *Teulet*, v. 3, p. 75.

At the beginning of September, the Queen of Scots sent the first of a pair of "beautiful and rare geldings" to her cousin, the Duke of Guise. The second was not forwarded by that opportunity, because it was not very well.[1]

More important matters, however, demanded her attention. The proceedings of the Jesuit missionaries had compelled Elizabeth, on the 15th July, to issue a proclamation threatening the severest penalties, and promising rewards to such as should reveal their hiding-places. The penal laws were put in force, and if we may believe Mary Stuart, which it is not safe to do, the prisons were full of poor Catholics, whose treatment was such that most of those who were still at liberty were abandoning the country in despair.[2] Among these was a Catholic gentleman named Singleton, who for seven or eight years had had the principal charge of Mary Stuart's secret correspondence. Naturally, with such antecedents, he felt himself in extreme danger, and resolved to depart, while yet there was time and opportunity. The Queen of Scots quite agreed in the propriety of this step, for Singleton's arrest and examination might have been the source of great evils and inconveniences to her, and her partisans in England. She therefore sent him away, with letters to the Archbishop of Glasgow, giving an order for five hundred crowns down, and a pension of twelve hundred francs, as long as he remained in France. His connection with Mary Stuart was,

[1] Mary to Mauvissière, September 3.—*Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 177.

[2] Mary to the Archbishop of Glasgow, September 27.—*Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 179.

however, to be kept a profound secret, and, through the Duke of Guise, it was hoped that some honourable pension might be obtained for him from the King.[1]

The affairs of her dowry still mismanaged, and her revenue still plundered, elicited from Mary a vigorous remonstrance, addressed to Marshal de Cossé.[2] This was on the 4th October. The remainder of the year was passed in the seclusion of Sheffield Castle, and we hear little about the Queen of Scots. The short days, or the long nights, were given up to religious meditation, or were passed in devising new plans for the despatch of her secret correspondence, now thoroughly disarranged by the departure of Singleton and the discharge of Jailheur.

With her own hand, the Queen of Scots penned a long and closely written paper of fifteen pages, much erased and altered, being religious reflections on adversity, "a thing of which she had had as much experience as any one;" citing various examples from scripture and from history, by which the afflicted, who may happen to read her little discourse, shall learn of others equally afflicted with themselves, and shall find that their remedy has always been in turning to their God.[3] It would have been well for herself, and for the world, if the Queen of Scots had never indulged in a worse occupation.

Shrewsbury was concerned about domestic matters, and was still annoyed by the withholding of his allowance for the diet of the Queen of Scots. He

[1] Mary to Archbishop of Glasgow, September 27.—*Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 179.
[2] *Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 183.
[3] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. xi., No. 37.

asked Baldwin to send him some scarlet cloth, at four nobles a yard, and some fine oil of roses, very pure and good, to cool his feet when troubled with gout. He was pleased to hear of the Queen's gracious liking of his two younger sons, Edward and Henry, "God bless them;" and he acknowledged the receipt of some torches by the carrier, delivered to the Bailiff of Sheffield.[1] Besides attending to these requests, Baldwin also sent his lord a cloak, and made urgent application to the Treasury for the diet money.[2] On the latter subject, Shrewsbury wrote to Leicester, thinking to obtain through the favourite what he failed to get by addressing the Lord Treasurer, or the Secretaries of State.[3]

As if mischief enough were not always brewing around the Queen of Scots, the provoking son of Venus must needs complicate the situation by causing one of Shrewsbury's servants to fall in love with one of Mary's female attendants. The indiscretion came to Shrewsbury's knowledge in the spring, and he had the young couple, Andrew Martin or Marvyn and Jane Knite, before him. "Both denied any assurance between them, each acquitting the other," so with a suitable caution they were sent back to their duties. Shrewsbury, however, deemed it

[1] Shrewsbury to Baldwin, Nov. 20th.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 241.

[2] Baldwin to Shrewsbury, Dec. 22nd.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 242.

[3] Shrewsbury to Leicester.

I perceive by my servant Larden, your good will towards me. I wish it were in my power to requite it. I pray you to help, with her Majesty, for the diet money. I have presumed to write once to her Majesty, but yet it is delayed, by what means I know not. As my trust is in you, further the despatch of it, for it grieveth me not a little that my true and faithful service is so little thought of. Otherwise I should have found her Majesty's bountifulness, which she shows so graciously to the meanest who serve her. However she considers of me, my loyal service shall never fail. Sheffield, 27 November, 1580.—*Holograph*, p. 1. *Add. Endd.*—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. XI., No. 33.

prudent to give Martin leave of absence during the summer, that his love might cool; but his affection for the maid was very naturally made use of to serve the cause of the mistress. Reports of Martin's dealings reached the ears of Queen Elizabeth, and an order for his discharge was sent to Sheffield in November,[1] and promptly obeyed by Shrewsbury. The Earl parted with regret from his servant, because he had found him a very useful attendant during attacks of gout, but still he obeyed the order, and Martin was sent to London to be cross-questioned by the Council.[2]

[1] Leicester to the Countess of Shrewsbury, Nov. 23rd—Hunter's "Hallamshire," *Gatty's* ed., p. 105,

[2] The following is Shrewsbury's letter in reply to the order for Martin or Marvyn's discharge:—

I have received this evening your letter of the 23rd, telling me that my attendant, Marvyn, is a busier dealer than is fit, and advising his removal, which was not long in doing. Thus much must I say of the gentleman, if I say truly, that he has showed great care of his duty to her Majesty, and has professed great love and taken great pains about me, when troubled with the gout. By his hands I have been most eased when I had grief, which, thank God, has not been this half year. When I had it last, perceived some love entering betwixt him and Jane Knyte, the Scotch Queen's woman, I told him the peril thereof. He swore on a book he would have no further dealing with her, yet I never trusted him so well but that I had good espial over him. Gave him leave to be absent all the summer. At his return, before allowing him to continue in my house, I called him and her before me, when they both denied any assurance between them, each acquitting the other. Being a matter of such small moment, I did not think it well to have any more ado therein. He should not have tarried with me, if I had not seen that he had given over his folly. I hope her Majesty will think so, whatever my enemies give out. I know I am envied for doing my true service. Sheffield, 28 Nov., 1580.—*Holograph, p.* 2. *Add. Endd.—MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. xi, No. 34.

On the 14th December, Leicester wrote to Shrewsbury on the subject of Marvyn's examination, as follows:—

Leicester to Shrewsbury.

I have declared to the Queen your answer touching your servant Marvyn. The Queen did no way doubt your good and careful consideration of anything appertaining to your charge, but was glad you had taken order for absenting Marvyn when you heard of his dealing with the gentlewoman.

The Queen told me to speak with him. He denies having intended anything prejudicial to his service to the Earl or of the Queen, but confesses his wrong in causing suspicion, especially considering Shrewsbury's prohibition.

He did not intend marriage, but hoped by his intimacy with the gentlewoman to discover what might concern your charge.

Asked him if he informed you of it. He said no. Told him I marvelled at his conduct. The Queen desires Shrewsbury not to have him in his house while he has this charge. December 14.—*Holograph*, p. 3. *Add.—Talbot Papers*, v. G, p. 286.

The arrest of the Earl of Morton, at the close of 1580, on a charge of being accessory to the murder of Darnley, produced no little commotion in England and France, as well as in Scotland. He was accused by James Stuart, second son of Lord Ochiltree, who, along with the new Earl of Lennox,[1] shared the favour of the King, and was committed, first to Edinburgh Castle, and afterwards to Dumbarton, where his most deadly enemies had absolute power. The news threw Elizabeth into consternation. She at once sent Sir Robt. Bowes as a special envoy to Edinburgh to remonstrate, and collected an army of, it is said, ten thousand men, on the frontier, to support the action of any of the Scotch lords who might be tempted to take Morton's part. But her remonstrances were unheeded, and her assistance declined. Mary Stuart heard with satisfaction of Morton's fall, and encouraged her son to persevere. Writing to the Archbishop of Glasgow, she says:—

"I need not expatiate upon the wicked design of the said Queen and those of her council, having heretofore cruelly treated and persecuted those who were entirely innocent of the said murder, as myself and the Hamiltons, and many others; and now wishing to maintain publicly him who is convicted as guilty, and found by his own signature to be one of the principal authors of it. I pray you, then, to make all duty and diligence in your power to expedite the execution of that whereof I wrote to you in my last, and in the meantime, speedily advise my son to retire to Dumbarton Castle, if he finds himself pressed, and to go to France, or some other safe place, before matters come to an extremity; his person being of greater value to me than a hundred kingdoms of Scotland."[2]

[1] Esmé Stuart, Lord D'Aubigny, had been created Earl of Lennox, by James, on the 5th March preceding. He was raised to the rank of Duke on the 5th August, 1581.

[2] *Turnbull*, p. 302.

The King of France rejoiced to hear that Morton was at length treated according to his deserts, and the King of Spain, attaching the utmost importance to the event, gave his full approbation to all that Mendoza, his representative in England, had thought it necessary to do, advising him, at the same time, to be careful and dissimulate.[1] The struggle to save Morton was one in which England stood alone. Against her were arrayed the King of Scotland, the House of Lorraine, France, Spain, and Mary Stuart; but even with these odds to contend against, England might have won, and Morton might have lived, could Elizabeth have brought herself to act firmly and consistently. While she vacillated, the Lennox faction, supported at home and abroad, pressed forward their design. Morton was brought to trial on the 2nd June, and on the following day beheaded.

Negotiations between the two Queens, talked about in 1580, had suggested to Mary Stuart the idea that a solution of her difficulties might be found in the association of her son with herself on the Scotch throne. She had resolutely refused to recognize James's title as King, though pressed by her French relatives to do so; but it was clear that James, having tasted the pleasures of power, had no intention of resigning them. He wrote dutiful letters to his mother, admitting that all his honour came from her, and declaring that while he lived he should ever remain her very humble and obedient son; but he had no wish to see his fair professions put to the test by his mother's return to claim her

[1] Philip to Mendoza, March 6th, 1581.—*Teulet*, v. v., p. 221.

own. Mary Stuart probably perceived the true state of the case, and hoped, by the contrivance of an association, to regain real power, and at the same time satisfy the selfishness of her son.

As a first step in this direction, she appointed the Duke of Guise her agent or proxy in Scotland, and on the 5th January, gave him powers to treat, in her name, upon the conditions on which the association might be arranged.[1] Ten days later, she drew up and signed a formal declaration of her rights to the English succession, to be presented to the Queen of England, and, with her permission, to the two Houses of Parliament, but the document was received with no favour.[2]

Meanwhile Shrewsbury found himself still deprived of the diet money, and he was growing impatient and angry. The Christmas allowance had not been paid on the 26th January, and he wrote to the Queen, begging her to let him have it, and made most earnest suit for permission to go to London and plead his own cause.[3] He cared not for dis-

[1] Powers given by Mary Stuart to the Duke of Guise, dated at the Manor of Sheffield, 5 January, 1580-1.—*Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 185.

[2] Remonstrances addressed by Mary Stuart to the English Council dated from the Castle of Sheffield, 15th January, 1581.—*Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 190.—Thos. Wilson, one of the Secretaries of State, writing to Shrewsbury, "from the Court, this last of January, 1580-1," says: "The French Ambassador hath sent unto me a packet for your charge, wherein I think is no matter of moment, as he told me; and I think he would hardly trust me with any dangerous matter. There is no dealing with the succession, being expressly forbid." The last sentence means that the French Ambassador was forbidden to speak of Mary's right to the succession. Thos. Wilson was appointed Secretary of State in 1577, in succession to Sir Thomas Smith, and he died in 1581.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 250.

[3] Shrewsbury's letter is as follows:—

"May it please your most excellent Majesty, that where it pleased your Highness to commit the lady unto my charge, and to give me allowance this twelve years for the same, and now stay being made of it, I am humbly to beseech your Majesty to stand my gracious Sovereign, that in respect of my

ease, for the weak state of his body, or for the unseasonableness of the time of the year, if her Majesty would but give him leave to come up, and appoint some one to take charge of the Queen of Scots in his absence. The sight of her Majesty would make amends for all; and until her pleasure is known, says Shrewsbury, "I shall long as one with child, and think every absent hour a year."[1]

The true cause of Elizabeth's niggard-like behaviour was probably a desire to compel Mary to discharge the expense of her household out of her French dowry, so that she might have the less to spend in keeping her friends together. The money received from France was laid out in various ways

true and faithful service, I be not blemished with abatement of mine allowance. So, fearing to be tedious to your Majesty, as I am most bound, do daily pray for the long continuance of your Highness's reign over us, in long life and perfect health. Sheffield Castle, 26th January, 1580[1].

"Your Highness's humble faithful servant,

"G. SHREWSBURY.

"To the Queen's most excellent Majesty."

In a note on this letter, Lodge says:—

"Volume G. of the Talbot MSS. contains a great number of these expostulatory letters, the most remarkable of which are inserted in this collection. They are rendered particularly interesting by the intelligence which they convey of Elizabeth's behaviour to the Earl while the Queen of Scots was in his custody. Anxious for his fidelity, and dreading the escape of his wretched prisoner as the greatest misfortune that could befall her, we might reasonably suppose that she would have loaded him with her bounty; that his very wishes would have been anticipated, and no means neglected to attach him more firmly to her interest. But he experienced a treatment directly contrary. The Queen not only suspected him, but was continually imparting her suspicions to himself; refused him the comfort of seeing his own children; made herself a party against him in a dispute between him and his Countess, which had given him great uneasiness; espoused the cause of his factious tenants at the Council-board; denied him access to her presence; and, to complete his inconveniences, at last diminished an allowance granted to defray the necessary charges attending his trust, though the sum was originally so scanty as to require an annual addition from his purse. This little narrative would appear absolutely incredible, were it not supported in every circumstance by the evidence of those papers. What Elizabeth's motives were for so strange, and apparently so impolitic a conduct, is a question that defies all conjecture. Shrewsbury's obedience, however, could have been dictated only by those enthusiastic sentiments of loyalty which were not unfrequent in the days of absolute monarchy."—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 244.

[1] Shrewsbury to Walshingham.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 249.

useful to the cause of the Queen of Scots. Some of it went into Scotland, some provided pensions for exiled Scotch and English partizans, some for the purchase of presents, the payment of servants' wages, and the bribing of secret messengers; and Elizabeth's idea was that, if the Queen of Scots maintained herself, she would have less to spare for purposes that one Queen regarded as mischievous, and the other looked upon as matters of the first necessity.[1] The motive, however, was of less importance to Shrewsbury than the fact. He found himself facing a costly duty with supplies withheld, and his urgency, under the circumstances, may be

[1] Mauvissière, in the course of a long dispatch to the King of France, dated 10th February, 1581, says:—"The Queen of Scots should not have any fear with regard to the matter of the succession, nor that they enquire into it somewhat; but she has good reason to fear plenty of other things, such as the change of her keeper, the Earl of Shrewsbury; whom, to disgust with his charge, the Queen of England is advised no longer to pay the pension of twelve thousand crowns, which she has been accustomed to give him for the support of the Queen of Scots, saying that it would be better for her to use her dowry in maintaining herself than in promoting plots and practices in Spain, in Italy, and all over the world, and in Scotland, to trouble and stir up war with England, and in keeping up in all parts of the world a staff of servants and pensionaries on her dowry; whereas, if the opportunity of supplying them with money was taken away, she would pass her time in more repose and leisure. There is a thing in which I find myself more hindered, Sire, in serving the said Queen of Scots, than in any other matter whatsoever, and in which I have to proceed by indirect allusions, and by reasons, saying that the least that one can do to a prisoner when one detains him without reason, is to let him go, or to feed him, or, if he is a prisoner of war, to make him pay his ransom. Furthermore, that a King of Persia, having been vanquished, his enemies, asking him what he wished, he replied in one word: Royal treatment. They tell me that the Queen of Scots has not had any other [than royal treatment], and that I am as much her Ambassador as yours, that she writes to whom she pleases, receives news from all parts of the world, that I write to her as often as to your Majesty, that she is more happy and safe in her captivity, if she did but know it, than with more liberty, seeing that her mind could not rest long without getting into mischief (voyant que son esperit ne pourroit demeurer sans entreprendre quelque chose). Here again I have hope, as I am much entreated by the Queen of Scots to do something for the said pension, or at least cause the greater part of it to be paid him [Shrewsbury]; for in order to take away from her the means of giving from her dowry and employing it in practices and in supporting her servants, or to make her host, who is very avaricious, tired of his charge, as I have said, they will cut it down somewhat, either half or one-third, and but for me he would have had it cut off altogether."—*Teulet*, v. 3, p. 92.

excused. Secretary Wilson assured him that he had presented his letter to the Queen, but could give him no hope of receiving all he asked. His advice, and that of Walsingham likewise, was that Shrewsbury should "devise some good suit either in fee farm or otherwise," for his better allowance, and the Lord Treasurer was willing to support the application.[1]

February passed over without Shrewsbury gaining any satisfaction, and on the 23rd of that month he urged Baldwin to obtain the "full resolution" of the court on the subject, before he came down to Sheffield, that he might the better answer some of the Earl's creditors in London. Shrewsbury himself declined to receive merely verbal assurances, and said he should require letters from "Mister Secretarie," that he might have tangible evidence with which to sustain the very slippery resolution of the English court. In a postscript to this letter Shrewsbury adds:—

"I would have you buy me glasses to drink in. Send me word what old plate yields the ounce, for I will not leave me a cup of silver to drink in, but I will see the next term my creditors paid."[2]

The postscript was doubtless added to give effect to the appeal, and Elizabeth was able to see through the rather transparent device. So far from selling his plate, Shrewsbury was reported to be buying estates, and that story, true or false, was made use of by the Queen to justify her determination against paying the allowance.[3]

[1] Dr. Wilson to Shrewsbury, January 31.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 250.

[2] Shrewsbury to Baldwin, February 23.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 251.

[3] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 252.

In vain was she pressed; and, to evade the only fair answer, she invented the story that Shrewsbury had diminished the service of the Queen of Scots' table, and was treating her at meals in a manner unbecoming her rank, and the Queen of England's credit for hospitality.[1]

The health of the Queen of Scots, in the early part of this year, was such as to induce her to make urgent representations for more liberty to take exercise. In February, she pleaded with Mauvissière to use his influence with Elizabeth, and on the 1st May, she wrote a long letter from Sheffield Manor, giving a sad description of her enfeebled body.[2]

[1] Leicester, in a letter to Shrewsbury, dated the 19th April, after referring to the dispute with the Earl's tenants, and to the reports of his buying land, says: "My Lord, there is another report, which I understand is come from the Embassy here, by way of complaint against your Lordship which I know will much mislike her Majesty, that is, your Lordship doth of late keep the Scotch Queen there very barely for her diet, insomuch as upon Easter day last she had both so few dishes, and so bad meat in them, as it was too bad to see it; and that she finding fault thereat, your Lordship should answer that you were cut off of your allowance, and therefore could yield her no better."—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 252.

Mary denies that she ever made any such complaint. In a letter to Mauvissière, dated Sheffield Manor, 1st May, she says: "As to the expense of my maintenance, the Earl of Shrewsbury lately declared to me that he felt very much offended by a complaint which he said you had made about it on my behalf in terms and with particulars taxing his honour, as one of the councillors of this kingdom had informed him. I answered him plainly that I could not believe you had spoken in this manner, as much for the respect and good will which I know you bear him, as that you have never had any such charge from me, except in general with regard to my whole situation in this country, as could still be proved from my letters. You will oblige me by giving him assurance of this in the first letters you write to me, sending me word how you have proceeded in this matter, in order to clear it up and satisfy him."—*Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 222.

[2] In the letter of February the Queen of Scots says:—"My illness increased much during the last five or six days; and though I have been I may say at extremity, I could not obtain what was requisite and necessary for my health. At present I am a little better, though very weak and reduced. I should feel obliged if the Queen of England, my good sister, would pay a little attention to the things necessary for the complete recovery and preservation of my health, such as exercise on horseback round about here, when I shall get well. Do not fail to represent this."—*Strickland*, v. 2, p. 32. In the letter of the first of May, which is dated from Sheffield Manor, and addressed to Mauvissière, Mary says: "M. de Mauvissière, although I ought to have a care not to trouble you with anything for my own concerns in the midst of so many great and important negotiations in which you are at present occupied, I am nevertheless constrained to importune you again respecting my treatment and exercise in

With Elizabeth herself Mary pleaded the purity of her intentions, and the depth of her devotion. She protested, before God, that her great desire on earth was to unite herself and her son, that they might both conform in all things to the pleasure of the Queen of England.[1]

The King of Spain and his Ambassadors were permitted to see the other side of Queen Mary's intentions. De Vargas, whose letters from Paris in the early part of 1580 possessed so much interest and threw so much light on the intrigues of the Queen of Scots with Spain, died on the 7th July, and his principal secretary, Diego Maldonado, remained in charge of the Embassy until the end of the year. Mary Stuart and her Ambassador, the Archbishop of Glasgow, felt that the negotiations on foot were of far too delicate a nature to be entrusted to a subordinate. At every interview, Glasgow impressed upon De Vargas the prime im-

this captivity, seeing that in spite of all the promises of which you have formerly informed me (and even quite recently by your last letters), as having been made to you, there has not as yet been any order taken. And the Earl of Shrewsbury has freely told me, when I have spoken to him about it, that he had not received any information or commands on the subject. Therefore I pray you take steps that the intention of the Queen of England on this subject should be communicated to him, especially with regard to my exercise as aforesaid, asking for this purpose that I may be permitted to have here a carriage or a litter, to be able in future to take the air here about, having become so weak and debilitated, particularly my legs, that I have not the power, although I am better than I have been for the past six months, to take one hundred steps on foot: so much so that since Easter I have been compelled to have myself carried in a sedan chair, which is not, as you may judge, to continue very long, having too few servants fit for such work. You will also renew, if you please, the application previously made by you for the passports of my Lord Seaton and Mistress Lethington, or others of their quality, to come and serve me here, and at the same time for two women and two valets de chambre; not being able in the invalid state in which I have been thrown by ill-treatment for some years to be helped and served by so few servants as I have near me, as it will be necessary for me and not less honourable for the Queen my good sister."—*Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 220.

[1] Mary to Elizabeth, April 17.—*Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 217. I am inclined to think this letter belongs to 1582, though Labanoff places it among those of 1581.

portance of secresy, and even Philip had been cautioned against allowing the despatches to be seen by the members of his Council. In Paris, therefore, the Scotch negotiations slumbered during the whole period of Maldonado's tenure of office; and any communications that took place passed direct between Mary Stuart and Mendoza, Philip's Ambassador in London.[1] In the month of November, however, Juan-Batista de Tassis, the younger, was appointed Chargé d'Affairs at Paris, and arrived at his post on the 21st January, 1581. As soon as the intelligence of this arrangement reached Mary Stuart, she wrote to the Archbishop of Glasgow, instructing him to renew the negotiations of the previous year, soliciting an invasion of Ireland, the despatch of a recognized agent to Scotland, and the removal of James to Spain, for the purpose of marrying him to a Spanish princess, and placing the whole island of Britain at the devotion of Spain.[2] The Archbishop informed de Tassis that Mary had been pressed to labour for the Catholic cause in England as soon as her son was converted; but she considered Scotland ought to have the first consideration, and then it would have been possible, in the estimation of Mary Stuart, at once to labour for the re-establishment of Catholicism in England.[3]

[1] Writing to the Archbishop of Glasgow, on the 21st May, Mary says: "I have as far as I could without committing myself, advanced the negotiation with Spain, as much by means of the Ambassador here resident, who is a very clever and wise gentleman, as by Sir Francis Englefield, whom I have been constrained to employ, he having been chosen for that purpose by the King of Spain, and the chief men of his council, who give him much credit, seeing that in France there has not been for a long time anyone with whom you can communicate."—*Labanoff.* v. 5, p. 231.

[2] Mary to Glasgow, March 4; received in Paris, March 26.—*Lab.*, v. 5, p. 211.

[3] De Tassis to Philip, April 10.—*Teulet*, v. 5, p. 222.

The scheme was carefully concocted, and had wide ramifications. Mignet, in his "Histoire de Marie Stuart," has described it as a "vast plan prepared by the Jesuits, approved by the Pope, concerted with Lennox, having the adhesion of the King of Scots, assured of the warm concurrence of the House of Lorraine, which was to receive the military support of the King of Spain, and which embraced the restoration of Scotland to Catholicism, the delivery of Mary Stuart from prison, and her restoration to the throne."[1]

It was no child's play in which Mary Stuart was engaging herself, and the Spanish Minister was amazed that a prisoner dare enter upon such a negotiation.[2] He had heard the stories of the strictness of her confinement, and he knew very well how short a course his master would have taken, had he been in the position of Elizabeth. But the Spaniard was less aware than Mary Stuart of the lengths to which she might go with impunity. The conspiring and impatient captive presumed more on Elizabeth's good nature and reluctance to take the extreme step than she cared to admit, believing herself to be too well supported in England for real danger, and trusting very much to the sense of honour, chivalry, and prudence that animated her keeper. While she was in Shrewsbury's hands, Mary never seriously feared for her life, but when she passed into the care of men

[1] *Mignet*, v. 2, p. 230..

[2] De Tassis says: "I asked him (the Archbishop) also how the Queen, his mistress, dare venture on such attempts, being a prisoner in England? He replied that the more the King of Scots grew in power, the more careful would they be about doing any injury to his mother."—De Tassis to Philip, April 10. —*Teulet*, v. 5, p. 224.

of inferior rank and smaller reputation, her danger was often realized.

The story of her hopes and fears, as explained to de Tassis, seemed to him, as a man of the world, absurd. He perceived at once that Mary's scheme was impracticable, but in a charitable way, he remarked that one need not be astonished at such day-dreams, seeing she was a prisoner isolated from the world, for it was impossible for one so placed to treat affairs with the same clearness as those who had the management of them. It was obvious, de Tassis thought, that Mary Stuart's object was to convince the King of Spain of the opportuneness of the present moment to act, either openly or otherwise, for the re-establishment of her affairs, and above all to labour with a chance of success for the ruin of the Queen of England. The Spaniard asked what were the views of the King of Scotland about these proposals of his mother, and the Archbishop of Glasgow had to confess that he knew nothing on that important point. But, he said, the Prince had already sent the Queen an answer upon this subject, which he was informed was in all respects in accordance with her wishes. De Tassis further took exception to the complicity of Lennox in the plot; but he was told that that nobleman was entirely devoted to the Queen of Scots, and had broken off all relations with the Court of France.[1]

There was still something, however, that De Tassis could not fathom, and he sent a very guarded report

[1] De Tassis to Philip, April 10.—*Teulet*, v. 5., p. 222.

of his interview with the Archbishop of Glasgow to the King of Spain. Philip was quite as cautious as his minister, and wrote to Mendoza, in London, with instructions to advise the Queen of Scots to use her best endeavours to induce her son to become a Catholic, and make himself master of his kingdom, by getting free from those who oppressed him. When these objects were accomplished, Mary might assure herself of the support of the King of Spain.[1]

All this time the negotiations for the marriage of Elizabeth with the Duke of Alençon had been going on with more or less prospect of success. In June, a formal treaty was signed between the English and French commissioners, and had it not been for the insertion of a clause, giving Elizabeth power to defer the ceremony, an observer might have supposed the marriage would at length take place.

It was at this time Mary Stuart found herself somewhat inconvenienced in the management of her secret correspondence. Since the departure of Singleton, she had not met with anyone competent to take his place. Her negotiations had therefore fallen into the hands of bunglers, and she had been obliged, at great expense, to make very unsatisfactory arrangements. The frontier of Scotland, too, was so strictly watched, that her envoys to that country found much difficulty in crossing the border. In spite, however, of these disadvantages, letters continued to pass. Mary heard from her son, and derived from his letters and tokens great consolation;

[1] Philip to Mendoza, July 22.—*Teulet*, v. 5., p. 228.

but she failed to hear quite as much as she might have wished, and in May, informed the Archbishop of Glasgow that she was meditating on her deliverance, whatever price it might cost.[1] All would have been spoiled, however, by the inopportune disclosure of her negotiations with Spain, and the Archbishop of Glasgow was therefore reminded of the extreme danger in which his mistress would be placed, if either France or England got an inkling of her Spanish practices.

In July, the Queen of Scots was removed for a time to Chatsworth, and wrote thence to the Archbishop of Glasgow a long and formal instruction about the affairs of her dowry. The document is full of complaints about the way in which her affairs had been treated by the French Court, and concludes by expressing the eagerness with which she would accept, in place of dowry, a fixed income of 120,000 livres, as had been suggested, provided the payment were assured, not upon the surplus revenue, but by the guarantee of three or four solvent merchants. If an arrangement like this could be made, Mary was willing, she said, to surrender one-fourth of the sum to those who might be the means of bringing it about.[2] This incident furnishes a curious picture of the estimation in which State guarantees were then held. In our days nothing would be

[1] In a letter dated May 21, Mary says:—
"For I have become so ill and invalidish by the illtreatment which, for thirteen years, I have received in this imprisonment, that at whatever price it may cost, I am considering to seek after and facilitate my deliverance, and only wait to come to a final resolve for the answer to that which I have written and proposed to my son, to be once well assured and enlightened as to his intention."—*Labanoff*, v. 5., p. 231.

[2] Mary to Glasgow, from Chatsworth, July 10.—*Labanoff*, v. 5., pp. 238—252.

thought better security than a pension charged upon the Consolidated Fund; but such was the state of French finance, and such the prevailing dishonesty among officials, that the Queen of Scots esteemed the guarantee of private merchants better than that of the public revenue, and deemed the bargain so advantageous that she was willing to make a great sacrifice to have it concluded.

Mary was still at Chatsworth on the 31st July, when she wrote to the Pope expressing her zeal for the re-establishment of the faith in England and Scotland, and entreating his aid.[1]

During the summer, it became clear that neither the Pope nor the King of Spain was to be relied upon for immediate assistance, and Mary turned her attention to advance those negotiations with Elizabeth, which she hoped might eventuate in her enlargement from prison. If nothing more came of it, at least the occupation would pass over the time until Spain could intervene with effect.

In the month of September, the King and Queen-mother of France wrote autograph letters to Mary Stuart, urging her to accord the title of King to her son;[2] but she steadily refused to go one step beyond the concession of an association in the crown. Mary was seriously afraid lest France should agree to the recognition, and thus, as she thought, abandon her interests.[3] In her anxiety to avoid this, the Queen took precautions in two opposite directions.

[1] Mary to Pope Gregory XIII.—*Teulet's* "Supplement to Labanoff," p. 304.
[2] *Teulet*, v. 3, pp. 120 and 121.
[3] Mary to Glasgow.—*Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 253.

Hearing that George Douglas had been sent into France by her son, at the instigation of Esmé Stuart, Duke of Lennox, to induce the court to recognise his title as King, Mary instructed the Archbishop of Glasgow to protest against anything being done to her prejudice, and succeeded in preventing a formal audience between the King of France, or the Queen-mother and Douglas. The Archbishop also sought the Hotel of the Spanish Ambassador and furnished him with a copy of a letter from the Queen of Scots, in which she asserted her firm determination to abide by her first resolution, for an alliance with the King of Spain.

Mary's second appeal was to Elizabeth, before whom, in October, she laid her perplexities and gave expression to her devotion. She desired, she said, to prove to her son all her affection, and to admit him to a share with her in the crown of Scotland. To negotiate these matters, Mary desired permission to send an envoy to Scotland, in company with a gentleman selected by Elizabeth, to ascertain the views of James, and she was the more urgent in this request because of the state of her health, which led her to fear she might not survive the coming winter.

As to herself, Mary complained of new restrictions placed upon her liberty, which she could not bear any longer without imminent danger to her life, and she besought Elizabeth to take steps to be assured these complaints were neither groundless nor frivolous. If, however, the credit of her enemies was such as to secure the continuance, and even the increase of the severities exercised against her, the

Queen of Scots was resolved to make over to her son, not only the crown of Scotland, but everything else that belonged to her, or to which she could lay any claim in this world; and when she had thus despoiled herself there would be nothing left for her enemies to exercise their cruelty upon, save a poor sickly, dying body.[1] On the same day Mary wrote to Lord Burghley, begging him to forward the object she had in view, and help her to obtain the desired permission to send into Scotland.[2]

The success of these appeals was not a little aided by the report of Jesuit intrigues in Scotland, which had reached the ears of Elizabeth and her council. An English priest, named Waytes, had lately been in that country sounding the disposition of the King and Lennox, and met with a reception far from discouraging. Elizabeth therefore fancied that in complying with the request of the Queen of Scots she might, at the same time, glean some information about the state of the relations existing between Mary and her son. Robert Beale, clerk to the Privy Council,[3] was accordingly sent down to

[1] Mary to Elizabeth, October 10, 1581.—*Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 265.

[2] Mary to Burghley.—*Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 271.

[3] Robert Beale, Lodge says, was "eldest son of Robert Beale (a descendant from the family of Beale, of Woodbridge, in Suffolk,) by Amy, daughter of — Morison. He married Editha, daughter of Henry St. Barbe, of Somersetshire, and sister to the lady of Sir Francis Walsingham, under whose patronage he first appeared at Court, and was appointed Secretary for the Northern Parts, and a clerk of the Privy Council. He was a bitter enemy to the Papists, and perhaps somewhat inclined to Puritanism; wherefore, as Camden seems to suppose, he was chosen to convey to Fotheringhay the warrant for the beheading of Mary. He read that fatal instrument on the scaffold, and was a witness to its execution. We find him, in 1600, one of the commissioners at the treaty of Boulogne, which was his last public service; after which he retired, with many more of Elizabeth's inferior servants, to make room for the numerous and needy train of her successor."—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 264, note.

Sheffield, where he arrived on Saturday, the 11th November, and his letters to Walsingham afford a most interesting picture of the state in which the Scottish Queen then was. Mary was careful to make the most of her ailment, and Beale was suspicious lest his susceptible heart should be practised upon; but making every allowance, there can be no doubt that the Queen was at this time ill.

Beale reached Sheffield in the evening, and met with a hospitable reception from the Earl of Shrewsbury, who lodged him very honourably, and entertained both himself and his servants in the house. Scarcely had he shaken off the dust or the mire of travel than he delivered to Shrewsbury the Queen's letters, and desired him to inform the Scotch Queen of his coming; but as the hour was late, and Mary had been sick and in bed for three weeks, an interview was deferred until after dinner on Sunday. When admitted to the royal presence, Beale found the Queen of Scots sitting on a couch, and after the interchange of formal greetings, he entered at once upon the object of his mission. With regard to the overture made by the French King for recognising the title of the King of Scotland, he was instructed to say that the Queen of England desired to know more about it, from whom the proposal proceeded, and whether the King of Scotland was privy to it. He was to inform the Queen of Scots that Elizabeth had sent a messenger into Scotland to understand the King's intention, and on his return a reply should be sent to the Scotch Queen's request.

As to the second part of the Queen of Scots' letter to Elizabeth, complaining of her hard treatment, Beale desired to know particularly what she complained of. Mary heard him quietly to the end of his story, and then inquired after the health of his mistress, "using sundry great words of her good mind and devotion towards her highness;" and when Beale assured her of the Queen's welfare she "seemed glad." Passing thence to more serious matters, the Queen of Scots asked for his letters of credence, and finding that he had none, save the one addressed by the Queen to the Earl of Shrewsbury, expressed her dissatisfaction. Being urged not to insist upon so small a formality, she said she would consider both of the question of the title and of her griefs, and give him an answer on a future day. Then she entered into other speeches, how God had avenged her on her enemies, and particularly on Morton. Her son she took "to be a natural child that would recognise all duties unto his mother, and especially seeing she desired nothing but his benefit, being sickly and not unlikely to die or ever it were long." With these remarks the interview terminated, and the Queen was left alone with her attendants.

When Beale retired from the chamber he was followed by Secretary Nau, who promised to do all possible good offices between the two Queens, and met with the response that he had better advise his mistress "not to insist on such precise points of further credence, but roundly and simply to answer" what had been propounded.

On Monday, the Queen of Scots kept her bed all the forenoon, and was not well after dinner; but Beale was brought to her bedside in the latter part of the day, and urged her to give him some answer for her Majesty. Mary showed him the letters of the French King and Queen Mother, and said they advised her to join her son with herself in the titles and state of the kingdom, and she was minded to follow their advice. She desired Elizabeth to permit her to send some one to Scotland along with one whom her Majesty might appoint, to ascertain her son's mind. Till that was done, she could not descend to the declaration of any particularities, but if that were granted she would deal more frankly. She acknowledged Elizabeth to be lawful Queen of England, an observation of which Beale availed himself to deliver a homily on the vexed question of the succession, telling the Queen of Scots that more holes might be found in her and her son's Scotch succession than they were aware of, adding that the succession could only be determined by Parliament.

As regarded the Queen of Scots' complaints of her treatment, Beale elicited that her grievances were many. "Generally they were her imprisonment (for so she termed it) for fourteen years; the restraint in taking the air and going abroad, being sickly; that she was not allowed a sufficient number to attend on her during her sickness; that her dowry in France went to wrack for lack of good ordering, and refusing to allow her officers to repair to her. The greatest of all was the continuance of her Majesty's displeasure: as for the charges made

against her, she is desirous of being accused of them particularly, and is ready to answer them." [1]

The Queen of Scots was not the only distinguished personage who spoke her griefs into the ear of Robert Beale. Shrewsbury availed himself of the presence in his house of the brother-in-law of Walsingham to tell the story of his wrongs. The allowance for the diet of the Queen of Scots, so irregularly paid, and so long threatened with diminution, had at length been seriously curtailed. The sum of £52 a week, that had been paid to the Earl of Shrewsbury ever since the Queen of Scots came into his custody, in January, 1569, was now reduced to £30 a week. The former allowance had been quite inadequate to meet the increased charges of the household, but £30 a week was ludicrous, or insulting. Whatever men might think of his charges, he always spent £1000 "over your shoulder," even when the larger sum was paid. He had to keep up establishments for his sons, Lord Talbot and Gilbert Talbot, because the Queen would not have them to dwell where the Scotch Queen was, and each house cost nearly as much as one establishment for the whole family. The Queen of Scots, too, had an entirely separate service from that of the Earl. She had her own kitchen, her own servants and officers. All her doings were apart; and this of itself, Shrewsbury affirmed, cost him much more than her Majesty's allowance; and, adds Mr. Beale, "I think he says true, if he always keeps the guard and company which he has now."

[1] Beale to Walsingham.—Sheffield, Nov. 14.—A long document of 13 pp., signed by Beale.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. xi., No. 64.

Yet it was not altogether the money loss that troubled Shrewsbury, bad as that was, for he regarded the reduction of the grant as an indication of the Queen's displeasure. He feared some evil report had been made of him, of which he would like to purge himself in the presence of his Sovereign; and if he thought a little chiding would suffice to satisfy the Queen's displeasure, he would risk that, and come up to Court post haste, leaving sufficient order for the protection of his charge at Sheffield. The Earl was told that the Queen had found great fault with his absence for a day or two at Worksop, with the Archbishop, the Chief Justice, and others. He thought it hard that so little confidence should be placed in his judgment. He presumed that something, at least, was remitted to his fidelity and discretion, else his case would be very hard to be a continual prisoner, and have no leisure to go abroad and attend his own business. At the time he was away the Lady was sick in bed and not able to escape, even if the opportunity had offered; and besides that, every precaution was taken, and Shrewsbury's honour was engaged for her safe custody. He would answer for his trust as he had hitherto done, but he did most earnestly beseech the Queen to give him leave to wait upon her and give an account of his proceedings.[1]

This story of the complaints of Shrewsbury and his prisoner, Beale narrated in two long letters to Walsingham, dated the 14th November. It was a Tuesday, and just before the messenger was dis-

[1] Beale to Walsingham.—*MSS. Mary Queen of S.*, v. xi., No. 65.

patched, the Queen of Scots sent Nau to ask for a copy of the report, that she might see if it properly conveyed her meaning. Beale declined to furnish a copy, saying it was not the custom in such case either to demand or grant it. She must either trust him, or write her own version in her own way. This Mary at first agreed to do; but on second thoughts, she said she would remit all into the hands of Beale, trusting he would deal truly. Nau at the same time conveyed an intimation from his mistress that if permission were given her to send into Scotland, he would be the messenger chosen, as being best acquainted with all her affairs, and he asked Beale to be content to accompany him. "I told him plainly," says Beale, "that I would refuse, if possible. . . I neither like of the matter nor persons with whom I shall have to deal."[1]

The two former letters, to which we have referred, were written by a secretary, and signed by Beale, but a third, bearing the same date, in which he conveyed the above intimation, is written by himself, and seems to have been added in the afternoon, at the last moment, just before the messenger set out for London. On the 16th November, Beale wrote again, having in the meantime received letters from Walsingham, dated the 14th of the same month. The Queen, he said, was sickly, and not out of bed, and Shrewsbury was troubled with the gout. As to himself, Beale was tired of his occupation, and longed for his speedy recall.[2]

[1] Beale to Walsingham, Nov. 14.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. xi., No. 66.
[2] Beale to Walsingham, Nov. 16.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. xi., No. 67.

That same evening the Queen of Scots called Beale up to her chamber. He found her in bed complaining how much she was troubled with "a distillation that fell along her left side, which made her so sore and full of pain, that she could not turn herself, nor take any rest, and therefore had not long before laid certain things to the forehead to provoke sleep."

"By that which I hear of others, and see myself," continues Beale, "(if I be not much abused and deceived) I think her not to be well at ease; and my Lord and Lady Shrewsbury tell me that she hath been so these six weeks, and that for these two last winters she hath been in like plight. She imputeth the cause thereof to the closeness of the air, and that she is not suffered to go abroad, as her bringing up hath been, in so much as being once sick of an ague in France (as she saith) the means how to cure her was chiefly by taking the air; the want thereof had brought her into such a weakness and impotency of her limbs, as that she could not go six steps, nor sit up, and therefore was forced to keep her bed; and if the like restraint continued still, she said she could not long endure. Whereupon she besought her Majesty, that having some consideration and remorse of the state of her body, and her long imprisonment, and that she was her next kinswoman, it would please her to grant unto her some more liberty than hitherto she hath had, and desired God to revenge it upon her, both body and soul, if she meant any evil to her Majesty, or would attempt anything against her estate."

Mary then fell into a discourse on her devotion to her good sister Elizabeth, and of the state of things in Scotland.

"Her Majesty," she said, "had no reason to be afraid of her now; her heir was already born, and at his liberty. As for any more husbands she desired none, and besides her body was in such case, as that she was not fit for any such matter now.

She was old, if not in years, yet in health of body; all her hair was grey, and when she had made over her interest to her son, who would care for her when she could bring nothing?"

Touching religion she was a Catholic, and wished her son was, "and if he would read the books, she thought nobody could let [*i.e.* hinder] him." No alteration in religion need be feared, for Mary, belieing all her professions to the Pope, the King of Spain, and the Catholic powers, now professed to the agent of Elizabeth that she was not desirous to have the Catholic religion re-established in Scotland or England. "Touching her restraint," adds Beale, "she neither does nor can come out of her chamber. Her folks are not suffered to go abroad. She thinks much that her coach which the French Ambassador had made in London is not sent." The opportunity seemed to Beale to be a good one to procure from the Queen of Scots the ratification of the treaty of Edinburgh, made in 1560, and to extract from her some pledges against disquieting her Majesty's estate, "so that if she does the contrary, her Majesty will have her own deed to charge her with, which will be a just and apparent cause for the more straight dealing with her afterwards. She does not seem to desire to be out of the Queen's hands, but only to have more liberty upon any promise or assurance that may be asked of her."

"I have not," continues Beale, "entered into the second part of my instructions, nor delivered the French Ambassador's letters."[1] He was anxious to conclude his mission and get home again, yet could

[1] Beale to Walsingham, Nov. 17.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. xi., No. 68.

not move without specific instructions, and Walsingham was unable to convey them. For a whole week Beale waited, looking earnestly for some answer to his former communications, but, as nothing came, he made from time to time polite enquiries after the health of the Queen of Scots, "for manners sake, with Shrewsbury's assent."

On Sunday, Mary asked him up to her room, "where she still kept her bed," and chatted about the King of Navarre's sister, and her prospects as an heiress; of her own dowry, and how she was defrauded of it, and other matters, "but there passed no speeches worth rehearsal." On Monday, the Queen of Scots took physic. On Tuesday, Nau informed Beale "that she had been very sick, in doubt of her life," and begged that physicians and surgeons might be sent to consult with her own physician. Both Shrewsbury and Beale appear to have had considerable doubt of the genuineness of this illness. Shrewsbury affirmed that she had been in greater extremity the year before and sent for no physician. They suspected some devices to enable her to communicate with the Duke of Alençon, who was expected in London on a match-making visit to Queen Elizabeth; more especially as Nau mentioned his mistress's preference for the attendance of Dr. Astlowe.

The answer to the Queen of Scots was therefore discouraging. Beale merely said he would signify her requests and procure an answer. Mary wished for rather more than this. On Wednesday afternoon, therefore, when the gloom of November filled

the apartment, the Queen sent to invite Mr. Beale's attendance, and as soon as his feet were heard on the stairs all the candles were put out. Entering the darkened chamber, the envoy of Elizabeth could scarcely discern the bed on which the Queen lay, nor the forms of the ladies in attendance. Sobs greeted his ear, and in a feeble voice Mary addressed him. She spake of her illness, and said she could not tell how near her end might be. It could not be far off, if she continued in her present state, for she could take no meat, and was so weak that she cast up such drink as passed her lips. With death staring her in the face, and deprived of the consolations of religion, she had cause enough for anxiety about her own state, but the position of her son troubled her still more. "She would recommend him unto God, and desired her Majesty to be better unto him than she had been unto the mother; seeing that there was a God that would judge things aright. She desired Elizabeth to have such compassion of her sickly body, as that she might not be cast away for want of such help of physicians and things as she needed." Beale, somewhat astonished and discomposed, comforted her as best he could, discoursing on the beauties of a contented mind, and humility towards God, and giving her some excellent advice about the merits of our Saviour.

"Because of her weeping and of her women in the dark, I brake off further talk, saying that I would be loath to disquiet her, but commended her unto the Lord. About an hour after, having made report thereof unto my Lord of Shrewsbury, to

the intent I might not be abused, for that as I understood she had used such shifts sundry times before, and at my entry into the chamber the candles were suddenly put out; it was thought good that my Lady of Shrewsbury should go up to see how she did, who found her asleep. Wherefore talking with Mrs. Seaton about the suddenness of her sickness, she told her ladyship that she never knew her mistress worse; her side was very evil, especially her thigh and leg, that she took little sustenance, and less sleep, and could not long continue."

When the Queen awoke, her attendants informed her of the enquiries of Lady Shrewsbury, and, after supper, she sent Nau and Curll with thanks, bidding them strongly urge the request for medical advice. Shrewsbury rather roughly answered, that as she had physicians of her own it would do no good to send others, and if they did come he did not think she would follow their advice. Upon this Nau became more earnest, and said if his mistress died for want of such help, the Queen of England would be answerable before all the Princes of Christendom. Shrewsbury made light of these rather lofty words, and told M. Nau that her Majesty was able to give an honourable account of her actions towards his mistress, both before God and man, and no other Prince living would have treated her so well. Besides this, Shrewsbury plainly declared, that under cover of having physicians from London, sundry practices had been attempted, and it was therefore needful to be circumspect.

With this cold comfort the two secretaries returned to their mistress, and Lady Shrewsbury once more went to enquire how the Queen of Scots was.

She found her complaining, but her face was not much altered, though her voice was either fainter or disguised. The Countess of Shrewsbury's conclusion was briefly expressed in the words, "I have known her worse, and recover again." Beale was in a maze; he scarcely knew what to believe, "the parties are so wily with whom a man dealeth." On the one hand the illness of the Queen of Scots impressed him considerably, but the Shrewsburys, who knew her better than he did, made light of the matter. "It is certainly thought that she is not well," adds the Envoy, desiring carefully to guard himself against expressing too much.

"Her left side and thigh have long been ill, and to ease the pain she is forced to use continually medicines and poultices, which I have smelled myself, and Lady Shrewsbury has seen applied. She cannot stand or be out of her bed. Ordinarily, she eats but little, and drinks more, but not immoderately. She complains that her nutriment is wholly converted into phlegm, whereof many times she casteth up great abundance. She is continually dealing with physic to consume the phlegm and help the distillation which she says falls upon her side. I think it will fall out that she has a dropsy."

On the whole, Beale leaned to the idea that physicians might properly be sent, and he added, "If choice could be made of learned and honest physicians, who would not be corrupted, I think they might, by conference with her physicians, and sight of her, bring her Majesty a perfect report of her state."

Beale wrote a long account of all these proceedings, on Thursday, the 23rd November, and just as he was concluding, Nau and Curll came again to

say that their mistress was somewhat better, and to avoid suspicion, was content that medical assistance should not be sent, but only held in readiness in case she should be worse.[1]

Walsingham was scarcely satisfied with the result of Beale's interviews, and urged him to draw something more specific from the Queen of Scots, both as to her proposals and her complaints; but small success attended his efforts to carry out these instructions, and again he begged leave to return to London.[2] To satisfy Elizabeth, Beale reported at great length his conversation with the Queen of Scots about the proposed association of her son with herself in the crown, about the sending of messengers into Scotland, and other matters; but in his opinion, no more information would be got from her, unless the Queen sent her a letter. On the 28th November,

[1] Beale to Walsingham, November 23, 6 pages, signed.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. xi., No. 69.

In the postscript to a letter of the same date, written by Shrewsbury to Baldwin, he says:—"This lady, my charge, since Mr. Beale's coming doubts herself greatly. She and M. Nau have requested Mr. Beale to write up for physicians and a surgeon to come down and see her. I do not know what mind she hath, but last year she was in greater extremity and sent for no physician. It were best if physicians were in readiness, so as to come at the next advertisement."—*Talbot Papers*, G. 95.

[2] In a letter to Walsingham, dated Nov. 24, Beale says:—

"I have just received your letters of the 21st. In answer, I can say nothing more than by former letters. I have as much as possible pressed this lady with the latter part of her letter, and sought all means to draw somewhat from her. Her answer is that one part of the letter must be construed with the other, and that her meaning to discover such great matters as she wrote of, depended upon the granting of licence to send into Scotland.

"Wrote yesterday of her health. Since then a physician who attends Shrewsbury, having felt her pulse, finds her not so weak as she would seem.

"We conceive that she seeks some means to write or send to London, while Monsieur is there, in which she thinks she is too much restrained.

"When I have access to her, will tell her what you write about not allowing him to pass who was despatched into Scotland, and will try all I can to learn more of her, though I have no hope of doing more than I have done. From Sheffield, by the same post that brought your letters, 24th Nov.

"I wish to come home, my health not having been good here."—*Holograph, p.* 2. *Add. Endd.—MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. xi., No. 70.

he was able to say that the Queen of Scots was considerably better, and he trusted there would be no need to send physicians.[1]

Beale's letter is as follows:—

Robert Beale to Walsingham.

"On receiving your letters of the 21st, I have had access to her chamber. After some speeches of visitation, I told her that I had received letters telling me that her Majesty was removed to Westminster, and for that and other reasons, could not send a resolute answer to her, which otherwise she would have done; but I was to declare to her that as she had, without any exception, promised to communicate to the person sent by her Majesty certain matters of importance touching this cession of the title to her son and other matters, it was marvelled that she had as yet discovered no such matter to me. I prayed her to speak frankly, according to her promise, saying that such plain and round dealing might be a means to procure the Queen's favour.

"She replied that she had answered this before, that one part of her letter was to be taken with the other, and it would appear that she demanded leave to send to her son *devant que passer plus oultre;* she thought it was only sought to get something from her, and that no good would come thereof, as had happened to her many times before; therefore, before being assured of the Queen's favour and liberty to send into Scotland, it would be folly to disclose anything and satisfy other folks' turns and not her own; if the Queen will grant her request, she will do nothing without her advice. She intended to deal plainly, to inform the Queen of the instructions she gave her agent, and forbid him doing anything without the privity of the Queen's agent; her son's will being thus known at their return, she would likewise do nothing without the Queen's consent. If the Queen, before their going, wished to have anything done in Scotland, she would interpose her authority, and perhaps do her good service. She needed not to have disclosed what she has done, but from goodwill, and might have commissioned her

[1] Beale to Walsingham, Nov. 28.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. xi., No. 71.

friends in France to do as much as is required by her son and the French King and Queen-Mother; but she desired to inform her Majesty first, so that whatever might happen afterward, she might be thought blameless.

"I told her that the chief stay of her Majesty's resolution was because the messenger whom she had sent into Scotland was not allowed to pass; and she could not but marvel at this strange dealing, as she had deserved well of the King and them all.

"She answered that she was very sorry; that she saw matters were growing worse and worse, and therefore she was so desirous to salve them if it might be; as long as they perceived in Scotland that her Majesty and she were two, so long would there be troubles; the Queen could not reduce things to the pass she desired, without her; she would make them desperate, but would never rule them as she listed; if they both sent, she does not think there would be such denial or stay made; Lennox dare not do it, as he and Antragnes, his father-in-law, depend so much upon her friends in France; and dare not risk their displeasure by refusing, the best and greatest of them all would be contented with her interposition, for their own profit and for the assurance of their estates; for whatever is done by a King of Scotland under twenty-five years is revocable. She therefore still desires leave to send thither, and if any refusal is made at the frontiers, she will consider herself beholden to the Queen; if she is not allowed to send, she will remain of opinion that her sending might have done good, and take some other course; she will, as she had written 'discharge herself of the whole,' but perhaps afterwards she will not be able to please her Majesty.

"I am moved to suspect that she means to make over the estate to the French King and Queen-Mother, and they to collate it to her son, whereby he shall be bound to the French for the procurement of the cession of the title and honour, and follow that faction; he will also think himself obliged to his mother, and will not dare to do otherwise for fear of the French.

"I told her that these matters that she required were of great importance, and therefore subject to jealousy and suspicion, so that too much circumspection could not be used; I wished to do the best offices I could, but did not wish to be deceived, and

asked pardon for telling her of myself plainly what might be conceived, and requiring her plain answer. First, I told her it might be conceived that this strangeness between the two realms has been long attempted by those who are said to be her ministers, to the overthrow of the state of religion and the breach of good neighbourhood and friendship, whereby they thought to attain the further practices, which they had in hand with the assent of the Pope and others. It was also suspected that the cession of her title to her son was already resolved on by common consent in France, between George Douglas and the Bishops of Glasgow and Ross, and on their agreement to certain articles it was thought convenient that she should thus part with her title to her son, and be moved thereto by the French King and Queen-Mother. The performance of these articles could not but bring innovation and subversion to that realm and great prejudice to this; and seeing that the resolution was already made, this sending into Scotland might be a colour for some other purpose; it was impossible that the party sent by her Majesty should detect the other, whatever he practised, and thus greater mischiefs might be procured than yet were known, especially when ambassadors were so little esteemed as to be denied access and be in danger of their lives. Propounded this as of myself, that my being here might not be idle, and to sound her that if I had to proceed to the second part of my instructions, I might have some matter from herself to charge her with. My whole speeches were grounded upon her letter in cipher to the Bishop of Glasgow and what I had heard of George Douglas's late dealing in France.

"In answer to this, she began with a solemn protestation and oath that she dealt plainly and roundly, and desired me to tell the Queen so; that this overture only proceeded from herself, for she desires to win her Majesty's favour; to her knowledge no other prince knows thereof, and she rather thinks they would mislike it; she confesses that in times past, she and her ministers have dealt with the Pope for money and for taking her son out of Morton's custody, whom she took for an enemy both to the child and to the mother. She swore that she knew not what was resolved in France, nor what her son's intention

was; George Douglas had done her great service and was well recompensed; and she thought still bare affection to her, and was therefore liked by her son, and considered the fittest person to do things agreeable to both; she knew that he would do nothing concerning her without the consent of those whom she had put in trust there, but she knew of no resolution or conclusion amongst them. She thought her son liked those who had been affectionate servants to her, and misliked those who had shown themselves otherwise; it was likely that he would follow her grandfather's steps, whom some of the nobility set up against his father, when but nine years old, and procured him to be slain; but when he came to years of discretion he cut their heads off, and made those his counsellers who had stood with his father; they had taught her son to put down his mother in his base age, and now he had begun to put down those [who] were the causers thereof. To confirm this, she said that when she sent Nau to him, Morton came thirty-six miles in post to Stirling to prevent it, pretended that her letters were directed to the Prince and not to the King, and that his honour would be much touched thereby, though she knows for certain that her son would have been well contented to receive them, and that he said, 'Whatsoever she termeth me, am I not her son, and is she not my mother?' She heard this from the Master of Erskeyn, who had been his tutor, from whom as I perceived she had from time to time intelligence, and means to continue her son's devotion to her. She added that if Nau had had access, perhaps Morton's head would have been on his shoulders now, for she did not wish that his adverse party should have come so high as afterwards he did. She inveighed against his government, as being full of pride, ambition, evil life, covetousness, impositions and pilling of the people, which she had never used, contempt of the nobility, and introductions of new torments, whereas the Boots were only before known in Scotland. It is commonly said that seeing a regent did these things, a way is made open to make such things lawful. She never heard of any who misliked his (Morton's) death, for he had often well deserved it. She was sorry for Archibald Douglas, and would help him what she might, for he had been her ser-

vant, and had sent her advertisements when she was prisoner at Loch Levin, and also sent information to her party in Edinburgh Castle. She desired no revenge nor innovation in the State. Her enemies were almost all spent, except Ruthven, Lindsay, and Lochlevin. Lindsay perjured himself by deposing that she voluntarily surrendered her title, 'but she pardoneth him for that he useth to swear much.' Lochlevin was a witness of her assent, but it was really compulsion; Atholl and Luddington [Maitland] had sent her word before that it was of no force; Sir Nicholas Throgmorton also wished her not to stick at it, lest they should proceed otherwise, for it was of no validity.

"She desired to be heard in Parliament, but Murray told her that would not be granted. Lord Herris desired some of the nobles to be deputed to know whether she assented to the act of resignation or not, and this being refused, made his protestation to the contrary. Ruthven and Lindsay brought her to Loch Levin; but she can forget and forgive all this, if they will be true subjects to her son. She desires to take nothing from them, nor to alter the state of religion and policy. She could not dissemble, but showed in her face what she meant in her heart, though she heard that her son could do otherwise. Even if the person she sent to Scotland should deal doubly, she could not deceive her Majesty, in whose hands she remained, and who might deal more hardly with her. She wished to have this matter ordered so that by her humble service she might win her Majesty's favour, and procure herself more liberty to remain in some of her houses. She knew not any thing that concerned her Majesty's person, or she would have disclosed it. These other matters may tend to settling the estates of both realms and to her Majesty's security hereafter, if Scotland be well assured, as she desires the mother and son to be; England has been most infested on that side, and may be still if this unkindness continues, and her son is forced in marriage and otherwise to seek other friendship, whereas she would have him depend wholly upon the Queen of England. She knows he has a good heart, and for that might well be her son.

I have put down these last two days' work at length, that

her Majesty may see I do what I can, and be fully informed of everything. I think no more will be got from her, unless the Queen will send her a letter.

"In reply to her ordinary complaints as to her imprisonment, I have not forborne to tell her of her Majesty's favour from the beginning and her evil requital. I have not descended to the second part of my instructions, waiting for further orders. When I am commanded to do so, I wish to know whether I shall give her a copy of her letter at the time of the northern rebellion to the Bishop of Glasgow, to see what she will say thereto, and show the original to Nau, in Shrewsbury's presence; or otherwise draw out some articles, which latter I think not best.

"She is well recovered of the pangs of which she complained, and I trust there will be no need to send physicians. Sheffield, 28 Nov., 1581.[1]"

The farce of negotiation was for the time played out, and Beale was ordered back to court. Before taking his departure from Sheffield, however, he made a formal note of such things as the Scottish Queen willed him to declare unto her Majesty, for greater liberty, for permission to send into Scotland, and similar concessions. He also noted Shrewsbury's requests for permission to come up to court, and respecting the unjust "rebatement" of his allowance.[2] M. Nau signed and delivered to Beale a memorial of requests to be made to the Queen of England on behalf of Queen Mary.[3] Supplied with these documents, Beale set out on his homeward journey early in December, and Sheffield, with its feudal lord and its prisoner of state, was left to spend Christmas with such merriment as the circumstances might justify.

[1] *MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. xi., No. 71. [2] *MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. xi., No. 72.
[3] *MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. xi., No. 73.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE year 1582 was memorable not so much for its achievements as for its efforts to achieve. Mary Stuart, with her Spanish and Jesuit allies, was pushing forward with diligence the schemes for revolutionizing England and Scotland, and restoring the Catholic faith; and while these plans were maturing, the heroine and object of the plots assumed a mask of meekness, and professed the highest consideration for Elizabeth, the utmost abhorrence for any one who should venture to disturb her throne, and the most resolute determination to abstain from any action calculated to unsettle the state religion.

After Beale's return to London, negotiation between the two Queens remained in abeyance for nearly four months. Elizabeth was too busy toying with the attentions of the Duke of Alençon to give much thought to the complaints and the requests of her captive at Sheffield, but Beale's representations did lead to some small concessions for her contentment. Her coach was sent to Sheffield, and the Queen was pleased to allow her to take the air abroad, provided there was no concourse of people to look on her.[1] Within the wide domain of Sheffield

[1] Shrewsbury to Walsingham, Jan. 6.—*MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. XII., No. 1. Shrewsbury says: "I have always taken care that when she went out walking, when strangers have come to speak to me on her Majesty's service, and for my own business, I have caused her to return to her chamber."

Park, covering as it did 2461 acres, and measuring in circumference eight miles, there was ample room for exercise; but still it was a prison, and had bounds, and Mary Stuart must have grown weary of the oft repeated exercise, and heart-sick while gazing on the familiar, though beautiful landscape. Her associations with Sheffield were those of adversity. No pleasant memories imparted to it a charm, or tempted the mind to dwell on happy days enjoyed amid its scenes. Since Mary Stuart entered its walls, sickness and suffering had been her ordinary lot; and though the Castle and the Lodge were to Lord Shrewsbury a well beloved home, they were to Mary Stuart dwellings of grief from which she would gladly have fled away. The liberty of the park was better, however, than perpetual promenading in the court-yard or on the leads of the roof, and, sometimes perhaps, when the Queen was well, and Shrewsbury was gracious, the ride or the drive might be extended beyond Gleadless Moor to Norton on the one side, or to Handsworth on the other.[1]

There was no hunting or hawking, however, at the opening of this year. Even the use of a carriage was more than Mary's strength could bear, for on the 6th January, Shrewsbury tells Walsingham "she has not yet stirred abroad, because she feels herself very weak, but void of pain, as she says."[2]

[1] Shrewsbury seems to point at some little indulgence beyond the strict letter of his instructions when he says in a letter to Walsingham, dated 9th April, 1582: "It was to good purpose not to let the said lady understand of greater liberty than within my park, for when her health shall require more, and I see it needful, I may well take order without making the same ordinary." —*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. XII., No. 6.

[2] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. XII., No. 1.

Shrewsbury opened the year with vigorous remonstrances against the reduction of his allowance, and, acting on the suggestion made a year before by Dr. Wilson, he applied for a grant of £200 in fee farm, which he desired might be given him without the appearance of his having asked it. With Burghley, Leicester, and Walsingham he made interest in this matter, setting forth the charges to which he was put, and promising that all he got should be spent in the Queen's service. "*Bysse datt que syto datte*," he writes, with his usual inattention to orthography, in closing a letter to Walsingham.[1]

In the Earl of Shrewsbury's family two domestic events occurred in the early part of 1582, the first a death, the second a birth. The young Countess of Lennox, mother of Arabella Stuart, and daughter of the Countess of Shrewsbury, died on the 21st January, and was buried in the Shrewsbury vault, at Sheffield. At the beginning of February, her sister Mary, wife of Gilbert Talbot, was confined of a daughter, to whom the Earl of Shrewsbury stood as godfather, and he directed Baldwin, his agent, to

[1] Shrewsbury to Walsingham, Jan. 6, 1581-2.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. XII., No. 1. In a letter to Baldwin, dated Sheffield, 25th January, Shrewsbury says: "I have written to my Lord of Leicester to remember her Majesty of my suit; declaring that £400 a quarter will hardly serve to find fuel, light, spoil of my stuff, besides many other heavy charges, and the keeping of forty soldiers daily in my house; and I have presumed that upon my Lord of Leicester's request, that both my Lord Treasurer and Mr. Walsingham will join with him, and so show them both."—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 256.

In a letter to Burghley, dated 2nd March, Shrewsbury makes similar statements as to the expense he is put to, adding, "And the greatest charge of all, which I hope will be recompensed, is my great care I have to perform my duty to her Majesty, which hath been a shortening of my time, which I have not, nor do weigh in comparison of my love and duty to my sovereign. If this deserves nothing, my fortune and hap is the worse."—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 261.

Leicester, in replying to Shrewsbury's request, on the 8th March, says: "Touching your causes here in hand I shall not fail to solicit them more effectually than if they concerned myself."—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 262.

hand over to the young father money to pay the nurse and midwife, "which will be 40s. to the nurse, and to the midwife as others give, which will be near as much as to the nurse."[1]

Nothing, however, occurred to cheer the spirits of the Earl. He was fast lapsing into that state of settled melancholy and bitterness, that made the latter years of his life miserable, and whether step-daughters died or gave birth to daughters, he was equally far from cheerfulness. With something between a snarl and a sigh, he says, to Baldwin, "I am removed to the Castle, and am most quiet when I have the fewest women here, and best able to discharge the trust reposed in me." Some of the servants of the late Countess of Lennox would have been glad to enter the Shrewsbury household, but the Earl declined to have them, saying, "I have too many spies in my house already, and mind to make choice of others I may trust."[2]

On the 1st of April, an appropriate day for renewing a mock negotiation, Elizabeth wrote to the Earl of Shrewsbury, in answer to the requests the Queen of Scots had made through the medium of Mr. Beale. Shrewsbury was to inform his charge that she could not send into Scotland until a proper explanation had been given of the rejection of the English Ambassador there; but she might receive a visit from one member of her Council in France, and from two physicians, and enjoy the liberty of exercise in Sheffield Park. Along with this letter were

[1] Shrewsbury to Baldwin, Feb. 10.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 257.
[2] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 257.

sent two from Beale, dated the 2nd April, one to be shown to the Queen of Scots, and the other giving information privately to Shrewsbury, that it was her Majesty's pleasure he should write as he had done, "and yet, nevertheless, it is meant that she should not know but that it proceeded from myself only." The letter which Mary was to see narrated at great length the communications Beale had made to Elizabeth on her behalf, speaking of her expressions of devotion, her desire to be on good terms with the Queen of England, and her determination, if her requests were granted, to "have no dealings with Papists, rebels, fugitives, Jesuits or others, which might go about to trouble the estate of the policy and religion now established, or to seek the alteration of the same." Shrewsbury was requested to procure from the Queen of Scots an acknowledgment of the correctness of this report of her intentions, and secondly, to persuade her to write to her son, begging him to explain away and apologise for the refusal to allow Captain Herrington, one of her Majesty's messengers sent to Berwick, to pass into Scotland. If these things were done, adds Beale, "Then she might be assured that that which she desireth should be granted unto her; yea, in case she can be brought to do so much, I am credibly informed and assured that her requests will be granted unto her." [1]

The device of this unofficial letter was doubtless resorted to because the English Court had some suspicion of the intrigues of the Jesuits, and desired

[1] Beale to Shrewsbury.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 263.

to draw from the Queen of Scots formal repudiation, or some useful information that might be used against her. The plan was one too well worn in Elizabeth's deplomacy to deceive so experienced a contriver as Mary Stuart. She saw at once that the pen of Beale had been employed to draw her into binding engagements, while Elizabeth and her Council remained entirely uncommitted. Beale's "daring to undertake," and "verily thinking" that his mistress would grant the requests of the Queen of Scots, afforded not the slightest foundation on on which Mary could depend. When the letters were communicated to her, she took them "in very good part, with many fair words and like protestation of her sound affection towards her highness, and her sincerity in the late proceeding with Mr. Beale." "But," Shrewsbury continues, "I have by circumstances gathered that she conjectures she is not dealt with sincerely, nor with such effect as she desires, and that she fears it is intended to entangle her by promise, and bind her without giving her mutual assurance of anything."[1] Mary, herself, expressed this fear more fully in a letter to Beale, dated April 16th,[2] and in a letter to the Archbishop of Glasgow, written on the 7th April, she declared her intention of confirming Beale's statements only by word of mouth, and that, too, with such new protestations and additions as would leave her quite free from every pledge, if the Queen of England failed to carry out the promises made by Beale.[3]

[1] Shrewsbury to Walsingham, April 9.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, XII., No. 6.
[2] *Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 288. [3] *Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 283.

Elizabeth was evidently playing at negotiation, but her caution was justified by the double dealing of the Queen of Scots, who, while she was promising to abstain from all transactions with Jesuits and plotters, was pushing, by the help of Spain, her old designs against the English throne, and was preparing to use the permission to send into Scotland, if ever it were granted, to enable Nau and the Archbishop of Glasgow to meet and arrange the details of those plans that had been so long under discussion in Paris, between the Archbishop, the Duke of Guise, and the Spanish Ambassador. Of this, however, we shall see more anon. At present Mary was dealing with Elizabeth, and her expressions were most dutiful. She readily assented to the suggestion of writing to request King James to explain the cause of the refusal to pass the Queen of England's messenger at Berwick, for to do so seemed nothing more than an empty ceremony,[1] and she enclosed the letter written for this purpose to Beale, that it might be read at Court before being forwarded to its destination.[2]

James, with ready compliance, wrote as his mother requested, to the Queen of England,[3] but nothing came of all these fair words, and the reason we may probably find by turning to the proceedings of the King of Spain and his agents.

There were three opposing interests upon which Mary Stuart attempted to play—England, France, and Spain. Each was jealous of the other, doubt-

[1] *Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 283.

[2] Mary to Beale, April 16th.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, XII., No. 7.

[3] James to Mary, June 17.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, XII., No. 13.

ing the motives of one another's actions, fearful of their ulterior designs. With each of them the Queen of Scots strove to be on good terms, heaping up assurances of sincerity and affection, professing devotion to the interests of each, and carefully keeping from the knowledge of the other two her dealings with the third.

There can be little doubt, however, looking at the three negotiations side by side, that it was on Spain that Mary's hopes now centred. Taken by themselves, one might be induced to believe that the dealings either with France or with England were sincere, for it is difficult to conceive of protestations more earnest or more solemn than those with which Mary Stuart sought to beguile Elizabeth, or to excite the sympathy of the King of France. But it was to Philip that she opened her heart, and exposed the true value of all the fine phrases expended on the English court. On the 18th December, Philip wrote to Mendoza, instructing him to find out whether France had not some secret design concealed beneath the proposal for the association of Mary Stuart and her son in the Scotch crown. At the same time he was to use all the means in his power to hinder the marriage of Elizabeth with Alençon, by exciting English jealousy against France; and lest Mary Stuart should feel any uneasiness because of the apparent friendliness of Mendoza's proceedings with the English ministers, she was to be assured of their hollowness, in order to dissipate her inquietude and give her satisfaction.[1]

[1] Philip to Mendoza, Dec. 18, 1581.—*Teulet*, v. 5, p. 233.

In addition to the royal plotters, there were Jesuits busily at work stirring up discontent among the people, forwarding secret letters, dealing with ambassadors, and making themselves as useful as they could in forwarding a movement which they hoped would result in the restoration of the British Isles to the Catholic faith. Campian, one of the leaders of the society, who had been arrested in the previous summer, was executed in London, on the 1st December, along with two other priests; but Parsons, the great mover in the mission, had been fortunate in making his escape to the continent. From that secure refuge he pulled the strings of intrigue in England and Scotland. Two Jesuits, Creighton and Holt, were sent into Scotland about the end of the year, and the reports they made highly delighted all the accomplices in the scheme. Making their way to Paris they poured into the ears of De Tassis the story of their success. Creighton, a Scotchman, went into Scotland, on the instruction of the Papal Nuncio in Paris, and of De Tassis, carrying letters of introduction from the Archbishop of Glasgow. Father Holt, an Englishman, had been sent on a similar errand by Don Bernardino de Mendoza, and the two met in the Scottish capital. Creighton was instructed, in the name of the Pope and the King of Spain, to ascertain the feelings of Lennox towards the Catholic cause, and if he found them satisfactory, to intimate that it was the wish of His Holiness and of King Philip to entrust him with the execution of a project to restore the Catholic religion, and set the Queen of Scots at

liberty. Lennox readily acceded to the proposal provided he was adequately supported. He was at this time high in the favour of James, and assumed a power to dispose of the young King very much according to his pleasure.

Mary Stuart, in proposing the association of her son with herself in the crown, intended so to manage matters that her son's position would be that of King only in name. Lennox, in assenting to the proposal on behalf of James, intended to leave to Mary the ornamental title, and retain for himself, under the name of James, substantial power. With these diverse ends in view, the negotiation for a time went on; but when it appeared that, in the mind of Mary Stuart, association meant the same thing as restoration to the throne, James and his advisers showed no disposition to agree to the proposal. At the time of the Jesuit mission to Scotland, however, both Mary Stuart and Lennox fancied they saw some advantage to be derived from the association; Mary in her restoration, and Lennox in the removal of the diplomatic difficulties caused by the non-recognition of the King by the Catholic powers. Hence the readiness with which Lennox met the overtures of the Jesuit messengers, for, though he had outwardly conformed to the Presbyterian Church, he was at heart a Catholic, working out Catholic ends. He satisfied himself that the project laid before him was for the safety of the Queen of Scots and her son, and declared his readiness to consecrate to its advancement his life and all his powers.[1] The Duke

[1] Lennox to de Tassis, March 7.—His words are, "to consecrate my life

formed, however, rather extravagant notions of the amount of assistance he should need, and of the value of his services. He asked that an army of twenty thousand men, paid for eighteen months, and composed of Spaniards, Italians, Germans, and Swiss, should be sent into Scotland during the succeeding autumn, with a sufficient number of pioneers, abundance of artillery and supplies, as well as money to raise native troops. He asked that twenty thousand crowns might be immediately sent, to commence putting certain strong places in a condition of defence; that the King of Scots should be declared commander-in-chief of the army, and that he himself, in the absence of the Prince, should take the supreme command of all the troops, whatever their nationality; and finally, he asked, in case of the failure of the enterprise, that he might be indemnified by the King of Spain and the Pope for all the losses that he might sustain. Lennox gave every assurance of the concurrence of the young King, and suggested that it would be desirable for him to go over to France to forward the enterprise, as soon as the Pope and the King of Spain had finally resolved on it.

These demands appeared to De Tassis quite absurd. Father Creighton admitted that he thought them rather exaggerated, and had said so to the Duke of Lennox, who replied that he left himself entirely in the hands of the Duke of Guise, who had been the first mover in the affair.

and possessions on condition that there are provided for me all those things which are enumerated in the memorandum which will be given you by the bearer." What those conditions were, is indicated in the text.—*Teulet*, v. 5, p. 235.

In reply to the enquiries of De Tassis about the state of religion in Scotland, and the prospect of restoring that country to the faith, Creighton was obliged to admit that, publicly, they were not encouraging. The heretic ministers appeared to possess more influence than ever; but in secret there were many powerful lords willing to acquiesce in the changes proposed by Lennox, and in case of success, there was some reason to hope that the young Prince would be restored to the Catholic faith. Speaking on behalf of the English Catholics, who were said to be numerous, especially in Westmoreland, and in the Bishopric of Durham, Father Holt assured De Tassis that they ardently desired the execution of this project, and would themselves take up arms as soon as they saw the enterprise established upon a solid basis.[1]

The Duke of Lennox, having settled with the Jesuit fathers the terms on which he was prepared to undertake the enterprise they suggested, wrote on the 7th March, to Mary Stuart, to Mendoza, and to De Tassis, informing them of his decision. To Mary Stuart he said, "As for myself, Madam, if it is your pleasure that the thing should be done, and that I should undertake it, it shall be done; and I hope that, if they [the Pope and the King of Spain] keep their promise, and the English Catholics also do what they have promised, the enterprise will come to a good and happy termination; and I will lose my life or deliver you out of your captivity."

Lennox desired a speedy reply, intimating that as

[1] De Tassis to Philip, 18 May, 1582.—*Teulet*, v. 5, p. 249.

soon as he had the approval of the Queen of Scots he should go into France, on pretence of attending to his private affairs, and there raise troops and prepare for the undertaking. All he asked was that Mary Stuart should recognise her son as King.[1]

This letter reached the Queen of Scots through the secret channels of communication maintained by the Spanish Ambassador, and she replied to it on the 6th April, when, according to Shrewsbury, she was growing pretty strong. Two points struck her as of the first importance towards securing a successful termination to so laudable an enterprise. First, active co-operation on the part of the Pope and the King of Spain; and, secondly, such assistance as would be needful wisely to direct the good will manifested by the nobles and people of Scotland. As to the second, Mary Stuart thought she could answer, but she was anxious to be assured of the succours in men and money upon which they might count from the Pope and the King of Spain. Lennox spoke in his letter of an army of 15,000 men, though in his memorial, addressed to De Tassis, he had asked for 20,000. Mary Stuart desired precise information, and some assurance from the King of Spain; for it would be a pity, she thought, to allow brave men to rush upon certain ruin by engaging, without due precautions, in so dangerous an enterprise.[2] She also disapproved of Lennox's journey into France, lest, as a subject of the French King, he should bring himself into trouble, and spoil the whole plot.

[1] Lennox to Mary, March 7.—*Teulet*, v. 5, p. 237.

[2] Mary to Mendoza, April 6 and 8.—*Teulet's* Supplement to Labanoff, 309.

Philip on his part was equally anxious for precise information. He wished to know with certainty how the young King received the admonitions and counsels of his mother; what was the state of opinion in Scotland; who were the friends upon whom Mary Stuart could count; what number of men she could place in the field; what were the fortified places and ports where the foreign soldiers might be received; what assistance did she expect on the side of France; and what were her hopes of help in England? If he were assured on these points, Philip was ready to give a formal engagement to render the assistance asked, when affairs in Flanders were pacified, or sooner, if means could be found.[1]

The conspirators meanwhile were not entirely of one mind among themselves. We have already pointed out the essential difference between the views of Mary Stuart and of the Duke of Lennox, as to the association of James with his mother in the throne. In the details of the negotiation they were also playing at cross purposes. Mary wrote to Mendoza that she wished to leave the matter exclusively in his hands, and she instructed the Archbishop of Glasgow to communicate nothing to the Spanish Chargé d'Affairs, in Paris. Lennox, however, wrote as freely to De Tassis as to Mendoza, and the Jesuits, who had visited Scotland, carried their report direct to Paris. Hence De Tassis became as actively engaged in the transaction as Mendoza, and we learn from his letters many interesting details of the plot.[2]

[1] Philip to Mendoza, April 23.—*Teulet*, v. 5, p. 239.

[2] Mary to Mendoza, 6th and 8th April.—*Teulet's* Supplement to Labanoff, 309.

Creighton and Holt, after communicating with De Tassis, held a secret conference with the Duke of Guise, the Archbishop of Glasgow, and Doctor Allen, "an English ecclesiastic of great importance, director of the Seminary at Rheims, and through whose hands the negotiation had been carried on from the beginning." At this conference some modifications were introduced into the demands of the Duke of Lennox. The troops asked for were reduced to 8000 men, Spaniards and Italians, with a sum of money sufficient to raise as many more troops on the spot as might at the moment seem necessary. Several meetings took place between these political ecclesiastics, and after settling, to their own satisfaction, every detail, Creighton set out for Rome, and Holt for Spain, to render an account of all they had done to the Pope and the Catholic King. De Tassis enquired of the Jesuits whether they counted on any assistance from France, and was told they did not. The enterprise, they thought, could only excite the jealousy of the King of France, who, if he knew of it, would immediatety give information to the Queen of England.[1]

Mary Stuart's confidence in her Jesuit allies was not unbounded. She thought their experience in matters of State by no means equal to their zeal in the cause of religion; and since the transactions in which she was engaged might cost her her life, and her son his estate, it was most important to instruct and admonish the holy fathers. "For," as she said, "these good men may make some grand mistake for

[1] De Tassis to Philip, May 18.—*Teulet*, v. 5, p. 244.

want of counsel and advice." Mary's wish was to leave no trace of her hand in the matter. What the Jesuits did they must do on their own responsibility, for she could not, with common prudence, accredit anyone, on her part, to treat with the Pope and the King of Spain.[1]

After writing to this effect to Mendoza, Mary sent, under the same cover, a letter, dated 7th April, to the Archbishop of Glasgow, telling him what she had done in answer to the suggestions of Beale, and promising to let him know if she succeeded in obtaining permission to send into Scotland. Meanwhile he was to hasten his departure for that country, under pretence of recovering his see and his patrimony, in order, as she phrased it, "that they might not perceive so clearly the game played between us." Mary intended the Archbishop and Nau to meet in Scotland, where, by word of mouth, they might more easily arrange their many affairs than by a prolonged and hazardous correspondence. And if, on the return of Nau, "this Queen should see fit to enter into a treaty with me and my son, as she seems now somewhat disposed to do, finding herself destitute of all foreign support and alliance, I shall easily find means to obtain your passage into this country." "Meanwhile," she said, "do not fail, notwithstanding all that may pass between this Queen and me, to prosecute the enterprise of which I wrote you in my last."[2]

The threads of conspiracy were growing numerous

[1] Mary to Mendoza.—*Teulet's*, Supplement to Labanoff, 314.

[2] Mary to the Archbishop of Glasgow, April 7.—*Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 283.

and complicated. There were plots within plots, and however sanguine the Jesuits might be of success, extreme caution was necessary for all upon whom ultimate responsibility would rest. Philip advised the enthusiasts to try the effect of a little preaching. It was better, he thought, to act on the understanding, to win souls by the true doctrine, and so, strengthening the Catholic party, wait for a favourable opportunity, rather than lose all for lack of patience.[1] Thus discouraged, the scheme of invasion remained in abeyance, and before it could be carried out some of the promoters were otherwise disposed of.

In April, Shrewsbury was still annoyed about the abatement of his allowance, and sought leave to come to Court, without success. His letters to Lord Burghley are most earnest entreaties for his assistance, so earnest as almost to derogate from Shrewsbury's dignity; but still the Queen took no notice of his suit, a result which Shrewsbury attributed to the adverse reports of spies.[2]

The physicians promised in April arrived at Sheffield in May—Dr. Smythe and Dr. Barsdale—using themselves very honestly and orderly, and putting their patient through a course of physic. They suggested the desirability of a visit to Buxton, to which Elizabeth assented, and then returned to London at the end of May.[3]

[1] Philip to Mendoza, May 20.—*Teulet*, v. 5, p. 252.

[2] I can say no more, but I have spies near about me and knows them well; if they said truly I could better endure it. Little said is soon amended."—Shrewsbury to Baldwin.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 275.

[3] Shrewsbury to Burghley, May 30.—*Talbot MSS.*, G. 146. Shrewsbury concludes his letter with the remark, "It would better content me to meet you there [*i.e.*, in Buxton], than to attend of her."

On the 13th June, the Queen of Scots set out for Buxton, and, after a stay of three or four weeks, returned to Sheffield in the early part of July.[1]

According to the French Ambassador, she came back in good health of body, and with her mind firmly set upon inducing her son to show himself favourable to the Catholic cause.[2] James was in fact a puppet in the hands of Lennox, and that young nobleman was using his influence to promote the interests of the old religion. The appearances that cheered Mary Stuart alarmed the Protestant leaders in Scotland, and led to the seizure of James, on the 22nd August, by the Earls of Gowrie, Marr, Glencairn, and others, and his confinement in the Castle of Ruthven. The Earl of Arran was arrested, but the Duke of Lennox escaped to Dumbarton, and afterwards made his way to France, where he died in May of the following year. The Raid of Ruthven, as the seizure of the King is called in history, entirely altered the face of Scotch politics. The Protestant leaders once more gained the ascendancy over the young King, and the hopes, founded by Mary Stuart on his reception of her overtures, were dashed to the ground.

In the month of August, Shrewsbury obtained the long sought permission to spend a fortnight at Court, and busied himself with the needful preparations for his journey.[3] He was then in tolerable health,

[1] The Queen set out on the 13th June, and Lord Shrewsbury availed himself of the opportunity to have an inventory made of the household goods, both at the Castle and Lodge.—See *ante*, page 151.

[2] Mauvissière to the King, July 26.—*Teulet*, v. 3, p. 131.

[3] Writing to the Queen on the 5th August, Shrewsbury says: "Having these ten years been secluded from your most gracious sight and happy

and feared if the journey were deferred beyond the end of the month, his old enemy the gout might cross his way. He suggested Mr. Francis Wortley, of Wortley, "one of the Council at York, and my neighbour, a gentleman both wise and of very good credit in the country," as the most suitable person to take charge of the Queen of Scots in his absence.[1]

On the 29th August, having perceived by Mr. Secretary Walsingham's letter that leave was granted, Shrewsbury wrote to Thomas Baldwin, his steward, to provide all needful things for the journey, to secure lodgings at Court for himself, and lodgings as near the Court as possible for his "folkes," even though such accommodation might be expensive.

"I think," says the Earl, "my company will be twenty gentlemen and twenty yeomen, besides their men and my horse keepers. I think to set forward about the 11th September, from Wingfield to Leicester, to my bed, and so make but four days' journey to London, which I think to be my next [nearest] way to Otelands, if the Court be there then; for I chiefest covet to go to the Court first, rather than go to London. If the Court remain at Otelands, you must foresee I have some carriages for convey of my bedding for self and some palletts for some of my folkes to lie about me. Write to me of these things so soon as you can, because I may let you know further of my opinion;

presence, which more grieveth me than any travail or discommodity that I have suffered in this charge that it hath pleased your Majesty to put me in trust withal, I have taken the boldness most humbly to beseech your Majesty that it may please the same to license me for a fortnight's journey towards your Majesty's most royal person; to the end you may by myself receive a true account of my said charge, and thereby know what my deservings are; wherein if I may (as I desire most earnestly) satisfy your Majesty, it shall be unto me a great encouragement to continue the most faithful duty and careful service that I owe unto your Majesty, and shall yield to my life's end."—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 279.

[1] Shrewsbury to Walsingham, Aug. 5.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 281. Mr. Wortley was the ancestor of the Earl of Wharncliffe, and appears at this time to have been on better terms with Elizabeth's government than we saw him to be in 1571, when his mother's house at Wortley was described by Lord Shrewsbury as "a solitary place where none resort but Papists."—Vide p. 205 *ante*.

and if it may be, for that I would gladly have Chesterfield fair past, where will be great concourse of people from all parts of England, to have it ended before my coming; and then it will be the 15th day of September before I set forwards. Send me word by the next how my friends thinks of it, and thereafter I shall do. I have written by post you shall not buy me no foot-cloth, if it be come to your hands, for I have one here, as good as you can buy me any, that shall serve my turn. I perceive by Mr. Secretary's letter, one shall come from above that understands French, doubting Mr. Wortley's understanding therein; if that be the case, Mr. Wortley, being somewhat learned in the law, understands . . . French, which, if it so please them, may suffice for so short a time; and so I end, this 29th of August, 1582."[1]

This journey to Court, so long anticipated and so carefully prepared for, never took place.

Shrewsbury was tempted in the first instance to delay his departure until after Chesterfield fair; and before the 15th September arrived, another and most mournful event intervened to cause delay. Francis Talbot, Shrewsbury's eldest son, died at Belvoir Castle, at the end of August, and his remains were interred in the family burial place at Sheffield, on the 3rd September.[2]

[1] Shrewsbury to Baldwin.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 284, 5. The following letter refers to the same matter:—

Aug. 23, 1582. Earl of Shrewsbury to Lord Treasurer Burleigh.

"My noble good Lord, perceiving, by letters from Mr. Secretary, the honorable respect you have to me, and weighing with myself the serious desire I have to see my most gracious Sovereign, my greatest comfort upon earth, whom God preserve, I take it the greatest friendship one friend can show another; Therefore, as I think myself greatly beholden to yo' Lordship many ways, so in procuring my coming up, now my health serves me so well, to see and do my duty to her Majesty, yo' Lordship binds me to honour you while I live. My desire is it may be within these three weeks, lest I be stayed by my enemy, against my will, and in my absence Mr. Wortley, being of her Majesty's Council in the North and of great Living and account, with those I will join with him in my house, will be sufficient to have this Lady forthcoming. So wishing yo' Lordship health as my own, I take my leave. Sheffield, the 23rd August, 1582."—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 283. [By "my enemy," Shrewsbury means, the gout.]

[2] The Earl of Leicester wrote a most edifying epistle to Shrewsbury on this occasion, dated "From Sonning Hill nere Wyndsor, this vte of September,"

In addition to the care and trouble arising out of the death of Lord Talbot, something also occurred to excite anew the jealousies and suspicions of Elizabeth, something the nature of which Shrewsbury either did not know or did not care to mention, even to a confidential servant; and in explaining the reason of his change of plans to Baldwin he offered conventional excuses. On the 15th September, Shrewsbury wrote, "the weather waxing cold after Michaelmas, and the plague being so rife in London, I know not how I shall see it till spring, which grieves me greatly."[1]

Shrewsbury was much depressed because of the suspicions of the Queen, from whatever cause they arose, and begged very earnestly for an opportunity to clear himself.[2]

and says, "I trust the Lord hath so well instructed you with His Holy Spirit, that ye will submit both the wisdom and the affections of flesh and blood to His divine and blessed providence, which, my Lord, both you and all men living, must wholly and only acknowledge to be the most Christian and most dutiful way; for to grudge at His will, or to repine at His good pleasure, what is that but plainly to fight and rebel against His power and ordinance. The Lord hath blessed you many ways in this world, and not least with the blessing of children for your posterity. He that sent you many might have given you fewer, and He that took away this might also take away all the rest. Be thankful to Him for all His doings, my good Lord, and take all in that part which you ought; be you wholly His, and seek His kingdom, for it far passeth all worldly kingdoms; for by Him all flesh doth stand and fall, and blessed are they that stand in Him. I trust as He hath taken this one from you, so will He leave your Lordship much and great comfort in the rest, who are many; and the rather if they and you faithfully and sincerely join together to honour, love, and serve His Majesty according to His blessed will and commandment. And thus my good Lord, being sorry to have this occasion to write to you at this time, yet whatsoever please God to exercise you withal, I cannot but show that love I owe you, which above all things is to put ye in mind of ye true obedience ye owe to the Lord your God, to whose blessed protection I commend and commit your Lordship."—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 285.

[1] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 285, note.

[2] On the 18th October, Shrewsbury wrote from Handsworth two letters to Walsingham, the one for his private use, and the other to be shown to the Queen. The letter intended for the Queen's eye is as follows:—

Shrewsbury to Walsingham.

"Right Honourable,—Your wonted good favour unto me emboldeneth me at this time to discover unto you the great grief of my mind, for that I have

In accordance with the permission given in April, M. du Ruisseau, a member of the Queen of Scots' Council in France, visited her in August, for the ostensible purpose of conferring on the subject of her dowry. His arrival appears to have been co-

heard of late her Majesty hath expressed some very hard conceits of me, to my intolerable discomfort. I was long since touched with sundry accusations, as your honour well knoweth, but the same proceeded out of the mouth of so notorious a lewd person, and without all manner of proof or likelihood, as your honour, and my other two lords, before whom both he and I were called, did say you thought me guiltless; and, after, it pleased her Majesty to send me word by my Lord Treasurer that she did not condemn me in anything, saving for certain speeches which her Highness called to mind herself had vouchsafed upon me in private, wherewith I was burdened by that fellow to have disclosed unto him. The truth is, it pleased her Majesty once upon some occasion to tell me how wonderfully God had preserved her from the malice of her enemies, and to prevent all their wicked practices against her; and, for example told that having on a time had notice of a man who had undertaken to execute mischief to her sacred person, the stature and some scars of his face being described unto her, she happened, as she was in progress, amongst a multitude of others to discover that man; yet not being astonied at the view of him, she called my Lord of Leicester, and showing the party unto him, he was apprehended, and found to be the same. Now this wicked serpent Cockin added, that thereupon I should infer and say that her Majesty thought herself a goddess that could not be touched with the hands of men; whereas I never uttered any such thing, neither any whit more than her Majesty's own sacred mouth pronounced unto me, the which I uttered to him as a proof of God's merciful providence over her, and that false addition proceeded only out of his most wicked head and perilous invention. And, for as much as I said to him, I hope that I neither discovered secret, nor betrayed any unfit thing; and yet this did so sink into her Majesty's conceit against me, as I verily think it hath been the greatest cause of her indignation. And for some other things wherewith her Majesty charged me, the last time that ever I enjoyed the comfort of her private speech, it pleased her, to the exceeding comfort of my heart, to promise that she would never condemn me without first calling me to my answer; and if there hath happened since that time anything to come to her Majesty's ears against me, I do most humbly on my knees beseech, according to her sacred word, to be called to my answer.

"Amongst the rest of my false accusations, your honour knoweth that I have been touched with some undutiful respects touching the Queen of Scots; but I am very well able to prove she hath showed herself an enemy unto me, and to my fortune; and that I trust will sufficiently clear me. But I humbly beseech you, sir, become an earnest mean for me to her Majesty, if it will please her to behold me with the sweet eyes of her compassion, that I may be called to account; and either try myself clear and guiltless, or else to be for ever rejected as a castaway. I am by birth, and so left from all my ancestors, a true loyal subject, and in that will ever live and die, and live I may (if it so please the Lord God) to do her Majesty some service; and therefore I hope she will not leave me to ruin myself with the thoughts of my express calamities, so that very shortly I may become in case therewith never after to be able to do either prince or country service. Once again, I beseech you, from the bottom of my afflicted spirits, to be earnest with her Majesty for me; whereby you may bind me to acknowledge you to be the only raisor and receiver of my mind and fortune, and to my life's end you shall find me a most thankful . . . for it. So, praying God to send you all happiness, I take my leave. At Handsworth, this 18th of October, 1582."—*Lodge*, v. 2, pp. 287-289.

incident with the time when Shrewsbury was preparing for his journey to London, and the intercourse between Mary and her adviser proved of itself enough to account for the jealousy and suspicion of the English court. Instead of confining herself to the question of her dowry, Mary Stuart used the opportunity of Du Ruisseau's visit to help forward her intrigue with the King of Spain, and to plot with the Duke of Guise for an invasion of Scotland.

With regard to England, Mary was still of opinion that it would be better to do nothing until matters were well reinstated in Scotland, unless the active interference of Elizabeth should render another course necessary; and in that case means would not be wanting to hinder her movements, by the action of the friends and adherents of the Queen of Scots. M. du Ruisseau was instructed to explain to the Duke of Guise the information that had been entrusted to him about the escape of the Queen of Scots from Sheffield Lodge, and the design of the Earl and Countess of Shrewsbury towards her.[1]

The latter expression is curious and suggestive. Can it mean that a design for Mary's escape had been planned with the connivance of the Earl and Countess of Shrewsbury, and that the spies whom Shrewsbury had about him conveyed the intelligence to Elizabeth? That Shrewsbury was a party to such a project we do not believe; but that spies may have affirmed that he was, is not improbable, and would fully account for the withdrawal of his licence to go to Court. That information of the

[1] Instructions given by Mary Stuart to M. du Ruisseau.—*Labanoff*, v. 5, 301.

transactions between the Queen of Scots and M. du Ruisseau did reach the ears of Elizabeth is evident, by the action she took. At the beginning of September, Du Ruisseau was about to depart from Sheffield, bearing from the Queen of Scots the treasonable instructions for the Duke of Guise, to which we have already referred, and also letters to Mauvissière, containing Mary's usual appeals to her good sister. She had fallen very ill, she said, eight days previously, and never stood in more need of the favour and indulgence of the Queen of England. If her condition were not ameliorated, she had but little hope of surviving the next winter.[1]

Du Ruisseau's departure, however, like that of Shrewsbury, was interrupted by orders from London, and the extreme step was taken of detaining him in captivity. The Queen of Scots too was restrained from the liberty of the park, granted her in the spring after her negotiations with Beale, and Shrewsbury refused even to permit her to write in remonstrance. At this treatment Mary professed to feel the utmost astonishment. She had done nothing, she said, to merit such harshness, and would answer for it that neither Du Ruisseau nor his company would be guilty of conduct justifying their confinement.[2] The instructions, of which Du Ruisseau was the bearer, were conveniently ignored while Mary Stuart was making these protestations. She wished them to be known neither to the Queen of England nor to the King of France, and Mary Stuart never

[1] Mary to Mauvissière.—*Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 298.

[2] Mary to Mauvissière, Oct. 8.—*Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 312.

for one moment hesitated in solemnly affirming whatever seemed likely to serve her purpose.

The seizure of James, in the raid of Ruthven, proved a most serious blow to the plans of the Queen of Scots, and she was quite at a loss to find means to repair the disaster. She wrote to her usual correspondents, to the Archbishop of Glasgow, and to M. de Mauvissière, and poured out her complaints; while grief and vexation brought on a return of the distressing malady in her side which had troubled her so long. Du Ruisseau was permitted to return to London about the middle of October, and on the 22nd, Walsingham communicated to the Earl of Shrewsbury the answers of Queen Elizabeth to the requests made by him on behalf of the Queen of Scots.[1] As was not unnatural, these answers failed to please the Lady, who spoke her mind freely to Shrewsbury. There were heart-burnings between the two Queens, as M. Nau perceived, and he communicated his discovery to the Archbishop of Glasgow, and told him how the captivity of the King of Scots had affected his mother and augmented her illness.[2]

On the 8th November, Mary found opportunity to write a long letter to Elizabeth, setting forth all her complaints, from the time of her arrival in Scotland, and protesting in most solemn language the sincerity of her dealings. She appealed to the living God, and said, "Remember, Madam, that to Him we shall not be able to disguise anything by the dis-

[1] Walsingham to Shrewsbury, Oct. 22.—*MSS. Mary Q. of Scots*, v. xii., No. 19.
[2] Nau to Glasgow, Nov. 8.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. xii., No. 24.

simulation and tricks of this world; though my enemies, under you, may be able, for a time, to cover their subtle inventions to men, and perhaps to you." She asked permission to withdraw from the kingdom into some place of repose, to seek some comfort for her poor body, worn out with continual sorrow, where, with liberty of conscience, she might prepare her soul for God, who was daily calling for it. She asked for the attendance of some honest churchman, to remind her daily of the course she had to finish; and, though she had so short a time to live, and need not care much about the size of her household, she asked for two bedchamber women to attend her in her illness. She protested that nothing she had done was to the prejudice of Elizabeth, or against the welfare and tranquillity of the realm, and concluded by saying:—

"Redeem the old pledges of your good nature; bind your relations to yourself; let me have the satisfaction, before I die, of seeing all matters happily settled between us; that my soul, when released from this body, may not be constrained to make its lamentations to God for the wrongs which you have suffered to be done it here below; but rather that, being happily united to you, it may quit this captivity to go to Him, whom I pray to inspire you favourably upon my very just, and more than reasonable, complaints and grievances." [1]

This letter, finished with scrupulous care by the Queen's own hand, was dispatched to the French Ambassador; but Mary, fearing it might prove too long for Elizabeth's patience, notwithstanding all

[1] *Strickland*, v. 2, pp. 39 to 54.—Mr. Robert Lemon, who transcribed this letter for Prince Labanoff, in January, 1844, remarks upon it:—"There is neither superscription nor endorsement to this extraordinary letter. It is wholly in Mary's hand, who has evidently written it with the greatest attention, and it is far superior to any of her other letters in that particular."—*Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 338.

the pains she had taken to make it legible and attractive, earnestly besought M. de Mauvissière to read it to the Queen of England. Under the same date, the Queen of Scots wrote to the Archbishop of Glasgow, informing him that her health got worse from day to day, and instructing him to use every exertion to obtain an answer from the King of France to her complaints about her dowry.[1]

The news of the captivity of James and the disgrace of Lennox reached Philip through a despatch of De Tassis, dated Paris, 5th September, and seemed to him little short of a disaster.[2] About the same time Mendoza informed his master "that the Queen of England was raising a great persecution against the Duke of Lennox, by means of the Earl of Angus, whom she provided with money for that purpose;" and Philip was strongly of opinion that if Lennox lost courage and quitted Scotland, his departure would have the most mischievous influence on the state of affairs. To support the Duke, therefore, and the Catholic cause, Philip so far aroused himself from his wonted slowness, as to send to his Ambassador in Paris ten thousand crowns, to be used in forwarding that object, and at the same time endeavoured to gain the confidence of the Duke of Guise by protesting the purity of his motives. All he wanted, he said, was to render service to God, to establish the Catholic religion in England and Scotland, and restore those countries to those to whom they legitimately belonged.[3]

[1] Mary to Glasgow, Nov. 8.—*Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 339.
[2] De Tassis to Philip, Sep. 5.—*Teulet*, v. 5, p. 258.
[3] Philip to De Tassis, September 24.—*Teulet*, v. 5, p. 260.

The King of France, meanwhile, touched by the communications made to him by Du Ruisseau, wrote a letter of half apologetic and very dainty remonstrance to Elizabeth, supporting Mary's entreaties for more liberty, more attendants and horses, and all other things needful for her health. "And furthermore," adds the King, "since there is nothing that touches us more nearly than peace of conscience, we pray you especially to permit us to send to reside near our good sister, the Queen of Scots, a French ecclesiastic, the most suitable whom we can choose, to sing mass and administer the sacrament to our good sister the Queen of Scots, in order that she may no longer remain without the exercise of our religion."[1]

The Queen of Scots explained to Mauvissière that she only desired to have the exercises of religion in private among her own people; but Shrewsbury was evidently afraid lest the presence of a priest should be made an occasion for mischief, and resolutely opposed the concession. "However," adds Queen Mary, "when I urged on him his duty of obedience towards his sovereign, in case she granted my request, I found him much less strongly opposed to it."[2]

In December, the King of France despatched La Mothe Fénélon and De Maigneville into Scotland, and Elizabeth sent Davidson along with them, to counteract their influence and support the Earl of Gowrie. Notwithstanding Spanish aid, the Duke

[1] *Teulet*, v. 3, p. 164.

[2] Mary to Mauvissière, December 3.—*Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 342.

of Lennox found it desirable to quit Scotland, and the year closed with the most gloomy appearances for the cause of Mary Stuart and of Spain. The partizans of the Queen of Scots, foiled in their plots, and unable fully to concert measures with their very imperious and self-willed mistress, were in great uncertainty, not knowing which way to turn. They could not act on the instructions of the Queen of Scots, who evidently failed to comprehend the situation, a circumstance not surprising seeing how imperfect was the information that reached her; nor could they devise plans of their own, promising any better result. Their mistress, the hope of the Catholic cause, in the fifteenth year of her captivity, seemed as far from the attainment of the object of her desires as when she commenced her course of opposition to Elizabeth by quartering the arms, and assuming the style of Queen of England, on the death of Mary Tudor. Her faction in Scotland was dispersed, her friends in France were but lukewarm, her Spanish ally was too much troubled with his own affairs, and too purely selfish and cautious to render effectual help; while in England her plans were discovered, her correspondence intercepted, and her person strictly guarded.

CHAPTER XIX.

IT was under circumstances so discouraging as those chronicled at the close of the preceding chapter that the Queen of Scots made another effort to retain her nominal hold upon the throne of her ancestors, by proposing again the association of her son with herself in the government of the country. The advisers of James had received former overtures of this kind coolly, well knowing that Mary Stuart at liberty, would leave but a shadow of royal authority for her son; and the persons into whose hands the King of Scots had now fallen were less likely than ever to submit a title, which lay at the root of their position, to the confirmation of the King's mother.

Conscious of this feeling, and yet fondly believing that James must in his secret heart entertain some natural affection, Mary asked no questions, but drew up formal letters patent, declaring the association, and sent them into Scotland by the hand of La Mothe.[1] Into the negotiations that followed we need not enter. The object of the French envoys was to deliver James from the Gowrie faction, and the object of the English, to prevent the success of the French. After three months' fruitless talking and writing, the Frenchmen retired, leaving the situation in Scotland unaltered.

[1] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. xii., No. 35.

In the little world at Sheffield smaller anxieties took the place of great ones. In the beginning of March, Shrewsbury was disturbed by the discovery of a barrel, filled with mass books, stowed away in a secret part of his ship, at Hull. Anxious to avert suspicion from himself, he gave instructions to the Mayor of Hull to apprehend the master and purser of the ship, if he had not already done so, and send them, if it seemed desirable, to the Council.[1]

A little later in the season, Shrewsbury was in doubt what to do with the ship herself. One Captain Carlile was about to make one of those semi-piratical voyages to the new world, so popular among the adventurous seamen of the reign of Elizabeth, and asked Shrewsbury to embark in the speculation to the extent of £100. The Earl was more disposed to send his ship than to find ready money, and accordingly wrote to Baldwin:—

"You know that I have already many irons in the fire, and sundry occasions, and, therefore, had rather disburden myself of some than enter into more; but if he like to take my ship with him, and that Mr. Hawkins be contented therewith, I could be the rather drawn to it, because I must set her forth and furnish her some way. . . . . I would you should talk with Mr. Hawkins about my ship, and hear his opinion what is best to be done for her. I think the best were to sell her if I might. I have no liking she should go a scraping, but I would you should see some way with her, because the time of the year passeth a-pace, and I like not she should lie idle. . . .

"I received, as this letter was a writing, another letter from you, with Mr. Hawkins' note, and others, of Mr. Carlile's[2]

[1] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 290.

[2] Christopher Carlile, an enterprising man, and one of the old low country soldiers. Through the interest of Walsingham, to whom he was distantly related, he was sent to South America, with Drake, in 1585, at the head of 2300 volunteers, and the success of that year's campaign was in a great measure owing to his good conduct. He died in 1593.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 291.

voyage to America; and if Mr. Hawkins like not to have my ship to go with him, I would yet that you should adventure one hundred marks with him in this his pretended discovery, rather than fail, for his friend's sake, and favourers of the voyage, if he be such a one as you report him to be."[1]

Besides his ship, Shrewsbury was concerned about some items of dress, and in the same letter to Baldwin, said:—

"If you can come by any stuff at brokers' hands, for the covering of stools, I would you should send me some down, because my covered stools are worn; and if you can provide any, you must then send down some little gilt nails to trim them withal. . . . . I would you should talk with the tailor, and devise me a jerkin of thin pretty silk, that is light and easy, to wear upon my doublet, under my gown or cloak; or else some perfumed leather, with satin sleeves, as the fashion is; wherein I would you should take my son Saville's[2] advice. I would you should remember my chamois jerkin and hose for winter, but I would have no silver or gold lace upon it, but some pretty silk lace, and perfumed."[3]

The keeper of the Queen of Scots had, however, other duties and occupations than the disposal of his ships, the clothing of his person, or the renewal of his furniture. In April, he was joined with Mr. Beale in a commission to receive from his charge "certain matters" which she was desirous to impart to the Queen of England, and to impart to her the answers of the Queen to the several complaints she had made. The instructions were long, filling twenty-nine pages of manuscript, and they took up, item by item, the complaints urged in Mary's letter of the 8th November, 1582, and also referred to a

[1] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 292.

[2] Sir George Savile, of Barrowby, in Lincolnshire, who married Mary, the Earl's second daughter.

[3] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 291.

letter of February, 1583, which has not come down to us. Elizabeth pleaded the crime of the Queen of Scots in the murder of her husband, as a reason for the change in her conduct towards her, and referred to her connection with the Ridolfi conspiracy. She quoted letters Mary had written to the Bishop of Ross, in 1577 and 1578, in which she styled the Queen of England, "Tyrant, faithless, anti-christ, usurper of titles, maintainer of all seditious and mischievous rebels of God and all Catholic Princes, for the cutting off of whom she had a way made by her holy Father for both their own and her relief." She also alleged that Mary had directed her ministers to inform other princes that many of the nobility were of her party; that the government of Elizabeth was so hateful to England, that any princes who were offended with it might easily take their revenge, and that it was a shame for Catholic potentates to allow a princess of the same profession to be used as she was. Notwithstanding every provocation to severity, Elizabeth pleaded that she had shown a large amount of favour. She saved Mary's life, at Loch Leven, and her reputation in the conferences at York and Westminster, and, lastly, when the English parliament would have proceeded judicially against her, Elizabeth was the only stay of the proceedings. "You shall therefore conclude with her," says the Queen, "that until she shall by thankful carriage of herself give us better cause than hitherto, we may more reasonably deny her requests than she justly require them."[1]

[1] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. xii., No. 48.

Beale arrived in Sheffield about three o'clock in the afternoon of Friday, the 12th April, and spent the rest of that day, and the forenoon of the next, in imparting to the Earl of Shrewsbury the instructions of which he was the bearer. After dinner on Saturday, the two commissioners were admitted to the presence of the Queen of Scots, and delivered to her the substance of their instructions. The communication was made in English, a language in which the Queen of Scots was less at home than in French; but as Shrewsbury understood little or no French, while Nau and Curll spoke English well, that language was selected, as, on the whole, the most convenient.

Beale found the Queen of Scots much better in health than when he saw her towards the close of 1581, though she was still complaining of her legs and hips, and he adds, "She is waxen far grosser than ever I saw her, rather puffed up, in mine opinion, than otherwise."[1]

At the very outset of the interview, Mary asked if the commissioners had any letter of credence, and made a show of breaking off the conversation when she found they had not. Beale explained, however, that they were sent not to treat, but merely to hear what she had to say, and communicate the same to their mistress. With many complaints and protestations, the Queen of Scots permitted the conversation to proceed, though she insisted that such informal negotiation was not the proper way of dealing with a princess of her quality. She had often, she

[1] Beale to Walsingham, April 17.—*MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. XII., No. 54.

said, been dealt with by words which were afterwards disowned and not performed, and maintained that dealing without letter was used only as a means to draw information from her of which advantage might be taken, while the Queen of England was committed to nothing in return. The difficulty, however, was waived, and the whole afternoon was spent in going through Elizabeth's answers to the letter of November 8th, and hearing Mary's explanations and replies. The questions were the old ones, about her treatment, her liberty, her dealings with her son, and her title to the English succession. Having spent several hours with the Queen of Scots, Shrewsbury and Beale withdrew, asking her to consider what had been said, and resolve whether she would impart anything to them.[1]

The discussion was renewed on the following day. It was Sunday, in the afternoon. Having gone through the instructions and heard all the Queen of Scots would say in reply, Beale enquired what manner of liberty she required, and what assurance she would give of good demeanour towards the Queen of England. Mary answered that if it were in her own choice, she would demand absolute liberty, but the manner she referred to the Queen and her Council; while as to assurances, she would give any that might be consistent with her honour. Thus the interview terminated, and though the conversation had wandered over a great number of subjects, the points at issue, as summed up by Nau, were the following:

[1] Shrewsbury and Beale to Queen Elizabeth, April 16.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. XII., No. 51.

I. Mary asked liberty to depart to France or Scotland, or to remain in England in some honourable sort.

II. If any further treaty ensued, the Queen of Scots desired it to be with her son jointly, for the establishment of good government and quietness in Scotland; the assurances should come both from her and her son, and she would have them ratified by her friends both in France and Scotland.

III. She offered that she and her son would enter into any perfect league for her Majesty's safety during her life, and for the protection of both realms afterwards from bloodshed and foreign invasion.

IV. She desired some grounds for more confidently dealing with Shrewsbury and Beale, namely, the Queen's handwriting, that upon reasonable offers she should not be denied her requests.[1]

Beale scarcely knew what to think of proposals which appeared so fair. On the one hand he thought of her "wiliness," and on the other of "her Majesty's suspicion and irresolution." Her offers, he thought, should not be neglected, and he adds, "For the preservation of God's religion, and maintenance of the liberty of my country, I could wish that something might be done, that they come not into utter desolation."[2]

After his interview with the Queen of Scots, on Sunday, Beale occupied Monday morning in writing an account of his proceedings for the information of the Queen of England, and on the afternoon of that

[1] Shrewsbury and Beale to Walsingham, April 16.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. XII., No. 52.

[2] Beale to Walsingham, April 16.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. XII., No. 53.

day had some further conversation with Secretary Nau. On Tuesday, his letters were sent to London, and the following day, while Shrewsbury "was away to meet some gentlemen at the cock fight," the Queen of Scots spent the greater part of the afternoon talking with Beale about Scotland. He found her fully persuaded of James's affection towards herself, and trusting that he would, when the proper moment arrived, give convincing proof of it. The poor mother was destined to be deceived. It was more to the taste of King James to build his mother's monument, than to sign a treaty for her release. Beale was careful to write an outline of his conversation with the Queen of Scots the same night, sitting up late to do so, and he despatched it to London next morning, by a messenger who travelled in company with Mr. Baldwin, the Earl of Shrewsbury's servant.[1]

Elizabeth accorded her full approval to all that Shrewsbury and Beale had done, and as the Queen of Scots made "such scruples to open her mind," she directed Beale to return to Court, and promised to send someone by the 2nd May, who would take charge of the Queen of Scots and set Shrewsbury at liberty to make his long promised journey to London.[2]

While letters were passing backwards and forwards, Shrewsbury and Beale continued their conversations with the Queen of Scots, and once or twice they accompanied her in the garden and park.

[1] Beale to Walsingham, April 17.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. XII., No. 54.

[2] Walsingham to Shrewsbury, April 21.—*MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. XII., No. 55.

She protested her good-will, talked much about her son, whom she heard from M. de la Mothe, "was very well grown," and pleaded for liberty. The Queen of England's letter directing Beale to return, reached Sheffield late at night on the 23rd April, and the next day, after dinner, its contents were communicated to the Queen of Scots. So abrupt a termination of the intercourse was not exactly what Mary desired, and on hearing of it, she entered upon another of her long discourses about Scotland, her son, and her liberty. After quietly listening to the end of her talk, Beale asked "whether she would command any service backward," a clear intimation that he was about to set out for London. Nau, however, seemed anxious to delay his departure, and on the morning of Thursday, the 25th, asked, on behalf of his mistress, that he might have some conversation with him in the garden. The request was not denied, and, Shrewsbury being otherwise occupied, Beale and the Frenchman paced the gravelled walks alone. Nau's speech was directed to three points: his mistress's liberty, the good estate of her son, and the maintenance of their right to the English succession. His mistress's liberty, he said, concerned both her body and her soul; she wished to have a priest to say mass, to give herself and her people the sacrament, *pro viatico*, when sick, a ceremony which he promised should be performed with discretion so as not to be offensive. Beale declined to deal in any such matter, and when Nau asked him what he should advise his mistress to do to win the Queen's favour, he replied

that he had no commission to give advice, but his private opinion was that she should do the contrary of all that she had done before, not repeat nor exaggerate things past, nor bring charges against the Queen and her ministers, but acknowledge her offence.

In the afternoon, about three o'clock, the Queen of Scots sent Curll, her other Secretary, to ask Shrewsbury and Beale to speak with her, and to them she made great professions of sincerity, and touched upon the same points as had been done by Nau in the morning. These things she desired them to declare to the Queen of England; and, having heard what she had to say, Beale prepared to set out on his journey on the 29th April.[1]

Beale's return to court, and the report he gave of his interviews with the Queen of Scots induced Elizabeth to change her purpose as to Shrewsbury's repair to London. Mary's ample assurances had evidently made some impression on Beale, and he was anxious that the favourable moment should be seized, if it were possible, to settle the succession. He therefore urged further and more formal negotiation, and Elizabeth acceded to the suggestion.

On the 27th May, Shrewsbury and Sir Walter Mildmay[2] were appointed to treat with the Queen

[1] Shrewsbury and Beale to Walsingham, April 26.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. XII., No. 59.

[2] Sir Walter Mildmay, knight, second son of Thomas Mildmay, an auditor of the Court of Augmentations, by Anne, daughter of — Read. He was educated at Christ's College, Cambridge, and came early into his father's office, in which he was appointed surveyor. In the reign of Edward VI., he had the chief direction of the Mint, and the management, under several special commissions, of the King's revenues, particularly of those which arose from the crown lands, the nature and value of which he had made his chief study. Thus qualified, Elizabeth gave him the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer, upon the death of Sir Richard Sackville, and he became a most useful, but not a favoured,

of Scots, and Mr. Beale was instructed to attend upon them. A formal letter was addressed by Elizabeth to Mary, to remove the great objection raised to the former negotiations, and the two Queens were once more engaged in discussing the frame-work of a treaty. The negotiations were, however, of short duration.

Mildmay arrived at Sheffield on the 1st June, and the same day delivered his letters of credence to the Queen of Scots, who received them gladly, and made many professions of sincerity; but the hour being late, further proceedings were deferred until the next day, when the negotiation was renewed. All the old points were gone over again, article by article, the Queen of Scots being apparently very desirous that some conclusion might be arrived at. She made great profession of plain and upright dealing, and expressed herself greatly wearied with her long captivity. Mildmay thought her much decayed in health.

On receiving a report to this effect, Elizabeth expressed herself willing to allow the answers of the Queen of Scots, "with some corrections," and wished "she had always behaved so honourably and sincerely," whereby much unkindness might have been avoided. Elizabeth understood, however, that

servant, for his integrity was too stiff to bend to the dark politics of that reign, and his consequent popularity excited the continual jealousy of his mistress; he was therefore never advanced to any higher post. He was a very learned man and an eminent encourager of literature: witness his donations to the College in which he was bred, and his foundation of Emanuel College, in the same university; which latter, having barely finished, he died on the 31st May, 1589. Sir Walter Mildmay married Mary, sister of Sir Francis Walsingham, by whom he had two sons, Anthony and Humphrey; and three daughters—Winifred, married to William Fitzwilliam, of Gainspark, in Essex, an ancestor of the present Earl; Christian, to Charles Barratt, of Avely, in the same county; and Martha, to William Brounker.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 220, note.

the negotiations had led to misunderstandings in Scotland, and thought it better to stay the treaty until an envoy could be sent to King James to disabuse his mind. Mildmay was accordingly instructed to return to his house in Northamptonshire, and there await further orders.

No sooner were those instructions commucicated to the Queen of Scots than she at once suspected they were but a pretext to break off the treaty, and expressed her opinion to that effect, "with great grief and tears." Shrewsbury and Mildmay tried to make the best of the matter, told her they were sorry to see her so grieved, and urged that the Queen's "good acceptance of her answers ought greatly to satisfy her." To Mildmay it seemed inexplicable that, considering the critical state of things in Scotland, more use was not made of the offers of "this woman." He, however, could do no more than urge his opinion, and carry out his instructions. He found himself in very good quarters at Sheffield, used with "great courtesy" by Lord and Lady Shrewsbury, and conceived that his Lordship was "an honourable and faithful servant to her Majesty, and very careful of doing everything to her liking and for her safety."

Lady Arabella Stuart, then seven years old, was living with her grandmother, Lady Shrewsbury, and this little scion of royalty, "a very proper child," gave Mildmay a specimen of her handwriting to show to the Queen, and desired him "to present her humble duty to her Majesty, with daily prayers for her."

Nau also gave to Mildmay a paper, showing the state of the Queen of Scots' dowry in France, from which it seemed that of the £12,000 to which she was entitled, only £1200 reached her hands, rather a heavy proportion for losses and plunder even in that age of scant morality. No wonder that the Queen of Scots was anxious to commute her dowry into a fixed pension, guaranteed by the bond of one or two responsible merchants.

Mary talked with Mildmay about Walsingham, hearing he had married the Secretary's sister, and said "she had found in him a plain and round nature, for when he said he would be against her he was so indeed; but she hoped that now, having better found by experience her disposition, and having discovered that she also was of a round and direct nature, he would in respect of that sympathy between their natures, be rather inclined to favour her in all reasonable suits and causes, for which she would be as thankful as might be in her power."[1]

Beale was sent to London with letters, and on the 17th June, Mildmay and Shrewsbury, taking with them the Queen of Scots, set out for Shrewsbury's seat at Worksop. There they received an intimation from Queen Elizabeth that she would not send alone into Scotland, a piece of good news which was at once communicated to the Queen of Scots. Even yet it was possible the treaty might have come to a conclusion, had not the miserable jealousy of James, and the fear of the Lords who were about him, raised difficulties, and before these were

[1] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. XII., Nos. 74, 75, 76, 81, 82 and 83.

surmounted, the discovery of another conspiracy against the crown and the peace of England, afforded a practical test of the value of Mary's fair professions. Indeed, however Elizabeth's personal feelings may at times have softened towards an unfortunate kinswoman, she was compelled, by the instinct of self-preservation, to keep her safely, for she understood quite as well as Don Bernardino de Mendoza that "the life of Mary involved the death of Elizabeth; the life of Elizabeth the death of Mary."[1] The King of France, too, recognized the hopelessness of Mary's position, and expressed his belief to Mauvissière, on the 28th June, that as long as Elizabeth lived the Queen of Scots would remain a prisoner.[2]

A summary of the treaty which the two Queens were at this time attempting to arrange is printed by Teulet, vol. 3, pp. 229-37, from a contemporary copy in the archives of the family of Esneval. It concludes with the declaration that the Queen of Scots will regard herself as free from every obligation contracted in the treaty, unless she receives a definitive answer in twenty days.

The real state of affairs was not, however, entirely apparent to on-lookers. Beale did what he could to procure a favourable answer, and the French Ambassador buoyed himself up with the hope that something effectual might be done;[3] but there were

[1] Mendoza to Philip.—*Teulet*, v. 5, p. 438. [2] *Teulet*, v. 3, p. 223.

[3] Beale to Shrewsbury.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 273, where the date is erroneously given, as 28 June, 1582, instead of 1583. Beale says:—"The Saturday after I departed from your Lordship I came to the Court, and delivered unto her Majesty such letters as I brought; besides, I declared unto her Highness so much as was contained in your lordship's, and Mr. Chancellor's [Mildmay's] letter,

influences working against Mary which no amount of generosity could overlook, the influence of her own ill-advised conspiracies and the dangerous plots of her allies.

and what I was willed by you to report concerning the late negotiation. It seemed her Majesty would take such deliberation therein, wherefore I have imparted the substance of the whole matter unto my Lord Treasurer [Burghley], the Earl of Leicester, Mr. Vice-chamberlain [Knollys], and Mr. Secretary [Walsingham], whom I earnestly solicited to procure an answer, for that the time prescribed by that lady draweth nigh to an end. I know not what will be the success; yet the French Ambassador, who had audience on Monday last, hath sent me word that her Majesty told him that I should shortly be dispatched backwards with a message that should be acceptable unto that lady, but I hear not of any resolution; the Lord grant that it may be good; I do what I can to procure a good answer, and that with speed. I have delivered unto her Majesty your Lordship's letter and message which was committed unto me, wherewith her highness seemeth to rest satisfied, as I declared heretofore unto your servant, Baldwin."

CHAPTER XX.

DURING the whole of this year, while Mary and Elizabeth were negotiating through the intervention of Shrewsbury, Mildmay, and Beale, the partisans of the Catholic cause had been busily plotting mischief abroad. The Duke of Guise, with his tool and dependent, the Duke of Lennox, cast about for the means of rescuing James from the Gowrie faction, and obtained countenance and support from the Pope and the King of Spain. In the spring, however, Lennox became seriously ill, and died in Paris, on the 26th May. This circumstance, together with other considerations, induced Guise to think that an attack on England might, after all, be the best way of commencing the enterprise. In Scotland, matters seemed to be working in the right direction, and on the 27th June, James recovered his freedom and resumed the reins of government. In England, too, Guise met with encouragement at the hands of a few busy and discontented Catholics who, in their enthusiasm, forgot the dictates of prudence, and promised a great deal more than they were able to perform. England was to be invaded, the Catholics were to rise, Elizabeth was to be assassinated, and Mary Stuart placed upon the throne; and so

enticing was the prospect, that even De Tassis was of opinion that the plan might really succeed.[1]

Money, however, was essential. The Duke of Guise thought one hundred thousand crowns should be placed at his disposal, and De Tassis warmly supported his application for that sum. But Philip's finances were sorely embarrassed. He had already found ten thousand crowns, and promised ten thousand more; nor was he prepared to say that his generosity towards so laudable a project would stop there, for he was willing to contribute as large a sum as the condition of his exchequer would permit. Philip also wrote to the Pope, urging him to find the money he had promised, and suggested, through De Tassis, that the Duke of Guise ought to press the question of money, both upon the Pope and his Nuncio, as a matter having special claims upon his Holiness.[2] But the Pope, as well as Philip, was cautious in undertaking pecuniary obligations; and though he was pressed by the King of Spain, and received, through Richard Melino, a special envoy of the Duke of Guise, most urgent representations of the importance of ready cash to the sacred cause, the Holy Father still hung back. In November, De Tassis expressed the utmost disgust at the Pope's niggardliness, and said it was clear His Holiness intended to throw all the responsibility of delay upon Spain, an intention which it was the great object of De Tassis to frustrate, for he was resolved to make it thoroughly plain that the delays came from Rome,

[1] De Tassis to Philip, May 4.—*Teulet*, v. 5, p. 275.

[2] Philip to de Tassis, June 6.—*Teulet*, v. 5, p. 277.

and not from Spain.[1] While the conspirators thus manœuvred to throw the burden on one another, time slipped by, and the plot was disclosed.

Philip, too, was cautious on the question of assassination, and urged the importance of the most inviolable secrecy. When he received from De Tassis, in June, a report that the project had been completely abandoned, he underlined the sentence, and remarked on the margin of the despatch, "So I believe we understood it here, and provided *they* did the thing it would not be amiss, although there were some matters to be arranged first."[2]

During the months in which the Duke of Guise had been pushing on his project with the Pope and the King of Spain, the King of France was endeavouring to bring the Scottish factions into accord, and defeat the efforts of Elizabeth to control the actions of the King. M. de la Mothe Fénélon and M. de Meyneville, supplied with elaborate instructions, used every endeavour to restore James to full liberty of action, and, as an inducement, La Mothe announced Mary's consent that the title of King should be given to her son, and that he should be associated with herself on the throne of Scotland. But the results were not encouraging. It seemed to Elizabeth, as she said to Mauvissière, that neither the young prince nor the Scotch nobles desired the association, and though they used fair words they were careful to avoid such a practical dealing with the propositions as would have resulted in a treaty.[3]

[1] De Tassis to Philip, Nov. 15.—*Teulet*, v. 5, p. 316. [2] *Teulet*, v. 5, p. 281.
[3] Mauvissière to the King, May 16.—*Teulet*, v. 3, p. 203.

Mauvissière was convinced that some reasonable terms might have been agreed to, if the Queen of England could have been assured of the thorough accord between James and his mother, and that their association on the throne would be acceptable to the Scotch people.

The Ambassador doubtless correctly interpreted the passing mood of Elizabeth's mind, as he found it in the middle of May, but the hard facts presented by perpetual conspiracies were not to be overcome by sentimental considerations, and Walsingham was on the track of important discoveries. According to the practice, and in keeping with the morality of the age, he succeeded in corrupting M. Chérelles, a secretary attached to the French Legation in London, who furnished him with copies of important documents, and among them many letters of Mary Stuart. He had also in his pay William Fowler, an old servant of Margaret, Countess of Lennox; while Archibald Douglas was playing the double part of betraying Mary Stuart to Walsingham, and pretending to betray Walsingham to Mary Stuart. With all this information at his disposal, and the reports of one spy to check against those of another, Walsingham was able the better to understand reports coming from abroad, and comprehend the different devices for the invasion of the realm, and the assassination of the Queen.

Mary was suspicious of Douglas, though she was willing to use him, and it must have been with something akin to a chuckle that Walsingham read in her letters to Mauvissière, furnished by the base

and treacherous hand of Chérelles, cautions against trusting Douglas too far, and advising him to reply to that worthy only by word of mouth, that he might have no written proof of the Queen's having secret intelligence; for, she says, "as you know, that would cause my liberty to be restricted for the future, or, by placing my host under the suspicion that he was not attending to his charge as he ought, would give an opportunity to my enemies and to his to take me out of his hands."[1]

In September, the Queen of Scots was permitted again to visit Worksop, and pass a few weeks at Shrewsbury's seat of Worksop Manor.[2] It was from that place she wrote to Mauvissiére the letter from which we have just quoted. On the 13th September, she wrote a short letter of compliment and affection to Bess Pierrepoint, a grand-daughter of Lady Shrewsbury's, whom, says Turnbull, "Mary had in a manner adopted and brought up with her from infancy." The Queen says:—

"Darling, I have received your letter and pretty presents, for which I thank you. I am very glad that you are so well;

[1] Mary to Mauvissière, dated Worksop, Sept. 3.—*Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 563.

[2] In a letter from Horace Walpole to Richard Bentley, dated Wentworth Castle, August, 1756, the writer says:—

"By permission from their Graces of Norfolk, who are at Tunbridge, Lord Strafford carried us to Worksop, where we passed two days. The house is huge and one of the magnificent works of old Bess of Hardwicke, who guarded the Queen of Scots here for some time in a wretched little bed-chamber within her own lofty one. There is a tolerable little picture of Mary's needlework. The great apartment is vast and triste, the whole leanly furnished: the great gallery, of above two hundred feet, at the top of the house, is divided into a library, and into nothing. The chapel is decent. There is no prospect, and the barren face of the country is richly furred with evergreen plantations, under the direction of the late Lord Petre."—*Walpole's Letters*, Ed. 1840, v. 3, p. 238. The building here described was destroyed by fire, October 20th, 1761. Walpole is mistaken in ascribing the house to the Countess of Shrewsbury. His allusion to the confinement of Mary in a wretched little bed-chamber is a curious example of the sort of fiction current in the best society before the days of historical enquiry and Record Office calendars.

remain with your father and mother freely this season, as they wish to keep you, for the climate and the season are so disagreeable here that I am already very sensible of the change of the air of Worksop, where I had not gone again, but I am not suffered to command my legs. Remember me to your father and mother very kindly, and to your sister, and to all my acquaintances, if there are any there. I shall cause your black dress to be made and sent to you there, as soon as I have the trimming, for which I have written to London. This is all which I can write to you at present except to send you as many blessings as there are days in the year, praying God that His may be extended over you and yours for ever.

"In haste, this 13th September.

"Your very affectionate mistress, and best friend,

Addressed— "MARIE R."[1]

"To my well-beloved bed-fellow, Bess Pierpont."

The treatment of the Queen of Scots was not different at Worksop from what it had been at Sheffield, as we may judge from the fact that, in November, Shrewsbury denies that while there she was permitted to walk in Sherwood forest.[2] Considering the state of her health, and the rheumatic affection of her legs, it is scarcely likely the Queen could have walked, even if she had been permitted to do so; and she expressly tells Besse Pierrepoint, in the letter just quoted, that she is not suffered to command her legs. We may, therefore, accept

[1] *Turnbull*, p. xxix.

[2] Shrewsbury to Baldwin, Nov. 3.—"Received his letter this Sunday, and have written to her Majesty and Mr. Secretary how untrue the report is of the Scotch Queen's having been in the forest of Sherwood, and that she was never out of my park during her abode at Worksop. I wish it may come to trial. I have also written to Mr. Secretary that Bentall has ill-will for doing me true service, and fears not the displeasure of wife nor child to execute my commands."

3 Nov., 1583. "Commend me to my boys, and God bless them."

Holograph, p. 1. *Add.* "To my servant Thomas Bawdwyn, at my house Coultarbar in London, with speed."—*Talbot Papers*, G 225.

in perfect confidence Shrewsbury's assurance that no such liberty was permitted her.

In connection with this visit to Worksop, it may be interesting to notice a letter from Gilbert Talbot to his mother-in-law, the Countess of Shrewsbury, which not only affords a glimpse of the quarrels in the Shrewsbury family, but suggests a possible ground of suspicion against the Earl. The letter is printed in Hunter's Hallamshire (page 117, Gatty's edition), from the Wilson papers, and is there assigned to the year 1583, but no more precise date is fixed. The internal evidence of the letter, however, shows that it was written on Thursday, the 19th September. The address of the writer is not given, but the letter commences by saying, "on Friday, at night, my Lord sent to me to be with him the next morning early. I came to Worksop about 9 o'clock, and found the two Earls together." The date of that meeting was Saturday, September 14th, and the two Earls were Shrewsbury and Rutland. After dinner the Earl of Rutland took his departure, and Gilbert Talbot rode some part of the way with his father, who appears to have been leaving Worksop, and was probably returning, with his charge, to Sheffield. On the way they talked of the family differences, of the suspicions of treachery that had fallen on Bentall, the Earl's gentleman porter, whose name has been several times mentioned in the course of this volume, and who was then in London undergoing examination before the Council, for supposed intrigues with the servants of the Queen of Scots. "I began," says Gilbert,

"many times to tell him my griefs, and to open my estate, but he would not suffer me to speak, but said he loved me best of all his children, and that I had never given him cause of offence but in tarrying so long at Chatsworth; which thing he also would not suffer me to answer, but said it was past, and he would not hear more thereof."

In the next sentence we gather the date of the letter. The writer continues, "He [Lord Shrewsbury] appointed me to meet him at Wingfield, tomorrow, at night, touching the cause with the purveyors which is appointed at —— chapel, the next day, being St. Matthew's day." It is clear, therefore, that Gilbert writes the day but one before St. Matthew's day, a day well known in the Calendar of the Latin Church as the 21st September. Hence his letter would be written on the 19th September, and the Saturday before, when he met his father at Worksop, would be the 14th of the same month.

The meeting with the Earl of Rutland may have been a very innocent proceeding, but it was capable of a suspicious construction. Shrewsbury was uncle by marriage to the young Earl, his first wife having been Gertrude Manners, and the conversation of the two noblemen, as reported by Gilbert Talbot, was about the Welbeck estate. But on the other hand, the name of Rutland is mentioned in the instructions given by the Duke of Guise to Richard Melino, his envoy to the Pope, as that of one of the English nobles holding estates in the heart of the country who favoured the enterprise of the Catholic conspirators.[1] Can we be surprised, therefore, if the

[1] *Teulet*, v. 5, p. 307.

suspicions of Elizabeth were aroused when she knew these several facts? A nobleman, whose name was on the Catholic lists, meeting with Shrewsbury, and perhaps with his charge, in the seclusion of Sherwood Forest, would have arrested the attention, and excited the interest, of a less hardly-pressed Government than that of Elizabeth.

The pressure was indeed severe at this time. On the 28th August, King Philip of Spain and the Duke of Guise gave joint instructions to Charles Paget, one of Mary's most active partisans, to pass into England on a secret mission, to ascertain the most suitable port for the landing of an army, to inform himself of the number of men the English would be able to furnish, and adding, "For our own part we can assure them that our forces will be four thousand or even six thousand men, if necessary: on which point they must let us know their opinion." To encourage the English Catholics, Paget was instructed to give the most formal assurance that Guise and his friends had resolved never to abandon them, but either to succeed in the enterprise or all die with honour. Paget was to select some port or harbour within fifty leagues north or south of Dover, where the troops of the Duke of Guise might land, and in the neighbourhood of which they might find either an entrenched camp or a citadel. It was important, moreover, that he should ascertain what munitions of war could be furnished, in order, if there were a scarcity of these things in the country, that the Duke might bring with him everything likely to be wanted. Paget was also instructed to learn

how many arquebuses, pikes, corselets, and other arms would be necessary to arm the natives; to find out, in good time, where the necessary horses and carriages for transport might be obtained; and the number of soldiers that it would be needful to pay in England, that sufficient money might be brought over to avoid the necessity of burdening the people, lest by that means a hostile appearance should be given to an expedition which was really designed for the rest and relief of the nation. Paget was further to assure the English, upon the honour, and in the name of the Duke of Guise, that the enterprise had no other object than the re-establishment of the Catholic religion and worship in England, and the placing of the Queen of Scots in peaceable possession of the English crown, which was hers. This end once attained, all the foreigners would quit the soil of England, and if any should refuse to do so, the Duke of Guise pledged himself to join all his forces with those of the country to drive them out.[1]

The plot was well devised, and the precautions seemed ample to cover all contingencies; but in this, as in so many worthier undertakings, the indiscreet zeal of a subordinate agent spoiled everything. John Somerville, a gentleman connected by marriage with the Warwickshire family of Arden, "in a moment of folly exclaimed, in the presence of several persons, that the Queen of England was the scourge of the Catholic church, and ought to die." Those who heard him attached little importance to his

[1] Instructions to Charles Paget, secret envoy of the Duke of Guise in England.—*Teulet*, v. 5, pp. 311-313.

words, thinking him a madman; but Somerville resolved to carry his folly still further, and set out for London, "declaring openly that he was going there to assassinate the Queen." These words reaching the ears of a magistrate, Somerville was arrested and sent to London, where he persisted in his declarations, and named as his accomplices his father-in-law, Arden, and his confessor, a missionary priest named Hall. These persons were arrested, together with some others who had known of Somerville's threats and had not revealed them, of whom four, though heretics, were well affected to the Queen of Scots. Lord Howard was arrested for having spoken in favour of Mary Stuart, together with Sir Francis Throckmorton, and his son George; and in a chest in Throckmorton's house were found two papers, one containing a list of all the ports in England suitable for disembarkation, and the other, the names of many of the principal Catholic gentlemen in the kingdom.[1]

The discovery fell like a bombshell in the midst of the Catholic conspirators. Lord Paget and Charles Arundel fled to France, and others concealed themselves, trusting that the storm would blow over, and that Throckmorton would reveal nothing. They comforted themselves with the hope that after all very little had been found out, and that their enterprise was only delayed, not completely spoiled. In this strain De Tassis wrote to Philip from Paris, on the 22nd December. He was assured that Elizabeth knew nothing positive about the pro-

[1] *Teulet*, v. 5, p. 323.

ject of invasion, and suggested that every means should be adopted to set her suspicions at rest. Still De Tassis, like a man of the world, and an astute diplomatist as he was, felt great uneasiness about the effect of the two papers found in Throckmorton's house; nor was he able fully to share the confidence of his English friends in the firmness of Throckmorton under torture, and events proved that De Tassis was right.[1]

Arden, when examined, protested his innocence, but Hall confessed that Arden had in his presence made a vow to put Queen Elizabeth to death. On the strength of this declaration both were condemned, and executed on the 20th December; and on the eve of that execution, Somerville, who had been confined as a madman in Newgate, was found strangled in his cell.[2]

Throckmorton was three times put under torture without confessing anything, first on the 23rd November, and again twice on the 2nd December, but, on the fourth application of the terrible rack, he revealed his plans and his accomplices, and soon afterwards was condemned to suffer the death of a traitor. Execution, however, did not take place until the 10th June, 1584, Throckmorton's life being spared during those months in the hope, and for the convenience of, extracting from him additional information.[3]

[1] De Tassis to Philip, Dec. 22.—*Teulet*, v. 5, p. 322.

[2] *Lingard's* History of England, v. 8, chapter 3, quoted by *Teulet*, v. 5, p. 322.

[3] *Teulet*, v. 5, p. 323, note. Francis Throckmorton was a son of John Throckmorton, chief justice of Chester, recently dismissed from his office by the influence of Leicester.

One of the prime movers in the conspiracy now laid open to the English Government was Mendoza, the Spanish Ambassador. His house had long been a rendezvous for discontented Catholics. He had been corresponding with the Queen of Scots and with the partisans of the Duke of Guise. He knew of the plans of invasion, of the projected assassination of the Queen; and when some of the conspirators grew faint-hearted at their prospects, it was Mendoza who imparted to them new confidence and stimulated them to action. We need feel no surprise, therefore, that this excellent representative of Philip's policy was called before the English Council on the 18th January, and peremptorily ordered to quit the country. He replied with words of contempt; but nevertheless he went, and diplomatic relations between England and Spain were suspended.

In a note upon this very remarkable man, M. Teulet says:—

"After having occupied for six years (1578-1584) the post of resident ambassador in England, where he energetically sustained the cause of Mary Stuart and the Catholics, Don Bernardino de Mendoza, having come to a complete rupture with Elizabeth, who accused him, not without reason, of fomenting all the conspiracies devised in her kingdom, was obliged to quit England, on the 29th January, 1584. From London he went to Paris, where De Tassis handed over to him all that concerned England and Scotland; and, after having occupied two months in obtaining a profound acquaintance with the negotiations commenced by the Chargé d'Affairs of the Catholic King, in France, he left Paris about the middle of April to wait upon the King, his master, in Spain. Don Bernardino Suarez Hurtado de Mendoça (or Mendoza, according to the modern orthography), fifth Count of Coruña and Viscount of Torija,

was a member of one of the most illustrious families in Spain. His ability and his energy obtained for him the special esteem of the Catholic King, and, of all the agents who forwarded the policy of Philip II., he was perhaps the one to whom that prince manifested the most deference. The King too fully appreciated the services which Don Bernardino was able to render him in the execution of his designs against France and against England, to remain long without employing him. The Duke of Alençon having died at Château Thierry, on the 10th June, 1584, Philip II. sent Mendoza to France towards the end of September, to offer his condolences to Henry III., and to Catherine de Médici; and in the following month he accredited him to them in the position of resident ambassador, in the place of De Tassis, who . . was named inspector general of the army of Flanders. 'From Paris, where he stimulated the Guises, where he inspired the League, Mendoza pursued with his hatred and his intrigues Queen Elizabeth, who found in him an enemy at once ardent and indefatigable.'—*(Mignet's* Mary Stuart.) He was, if not the instigator, at least the confidant and the zealous promoter of the Babington conspiracy; and in reading his correspondence, it is easy to understand that a project that had for its basis the long premeditated assassination of the Queen of England, must necessarily either succeed, or in the contrary event, inevitably bring about the catastrophe which terminated the life of the Queen of Scots:—*Vita Mariæ mors Elizabeth; vita Elizabeth mors Mariæ.* . . His last despatch among the papers at Simancas is of the 31st December, 1591. . . According to Moréri, Don Bernardino de Mendoza died the 4th July, 1595."[1]

The discovery of this conspiracy evoked in England an outburst of enthusiastic loyalty towards Elizabeth. Her people were indignant and alarmed, and testified, by every means, their attachment to the Queen, and their detestation of her foes. The French Ambassador, writing to his sovereign on the 19th

[1] *Teulet*, v. 5, p. 339.

December, gives a striking account of the Queen's journey from London to Hampton Court, and tells how the people "in large companies met her by the way, and, kneeling on the ground, with divers sorts of prayers wished her a thousand blessings, and that evil disposed persons who meant her harm might be discovered and punished as they deserved." The Queen "frequently stopped to thank them for the affection they manifested for her," and, turning to Mauvissière, observed, "that she saw clearly that she was not disliked by all."[1] It was indeed in such critical times as this that the heart of England beat true to its sovereign. When the skies were fair and storms seemed distant, Roman Catholics might listen with favouring ears to the voice of the Jesuit charmers; but when conspiracy led towards its legitimate goal, and they found themselves face to face with projects of foreign invasion and the assassination of their Queen, patriotism triumphed over the promptings of the tempters, and, with few exceptions, England, whether Catholic or Protestant, rallied to the defence of hearth and home.

[1] *Strickland*, v. 2, p. 77.

CHAPTER XXI.

IT is a little singular that in the midst of the excitement caused by the discovery of the Spanish plot, the Countess of Shrewsbury should have given to the Queen of Scots a most just cause of complaint. We have several times had occasion to notice the uncomfortable relations existing between the Earl of Shrewsbury and his wife, but fiercely as they might quarrel, and violent as were the family dissensions, the Countess had not hitherto become so lost to shame as to slander her husband. To that extremity, however, her passion now led her. About the end of 1583, Lady Shrewsbury, and two of her sons, spread abroad reports of an intimacy between the Earl and the Queen of Scots, and it was even said that she had borne him a child. Both Shrewsbury and Mary were hot in their indignation at these reports.

"M. de Mauvissière" wrote the Queen of Scots on the 12th December, "I will therefore further request of you, that while thanking the Queen of England, my good sister, for the hope which she gives me of putting an end to my too long captivity, [you will solicit of her[1]] that she see justice done to me against the Countess of Shrewsbury and her children touching the scandalous reports which they have circulated about me. This is a thing which I have so much at heart that I shall

[1] Words to this effect have evidently been dropped in the hurry of writing.

never have any pleasure until their wickedness is known, which it will be if people will make enquiry into it, as I beg you to do on your part; in order that you may see what people are the mouthpieces of the malicious ill-will they have against me for being the nearest relative of their Queen, who cannot deny me this justice. You will also, if you please, speak of this to the gentlemen of the Council of the Queen, my good sister: I presume that you will already have fully informed my son, as also the King, my good brother, and the Queen, my mother-in-law, and all my relatives in France. For I have firmly resolved to make my complaint so loudly throughout all Christendom, if satisfaction be not speedily rendered me here, that it shall be known everywhere how badly I have been used in all things."[1]

On the 2nd January, 1584, the Queen of Scots wrote openly to M. de Mauvissière, protesting the candour and honesty of her dealings about the treaty; a statement that must have provoked a smile on Walsingham's face, as he read it in the light of all the intercepted letters and foreign communications. For the Queen of Scots to affirm that she had proceeded in the treaty with "as entire, simple and sincere an intention as any Christian ever did in any action," was to state something untrue; for her to challenge her "subtle and malicious enemies," manifested a degree of hardihood not surprising in so courageous a person as Mary Stuart, and not excelled by any of her subsequent defenders.

In repelling the unworthy slanders of the Countess of Shrewsbury, Mary stood on firmer ground, and there is somewhat of dignity in her words when she says:—

"I entreat you to state publicly in my name, for which on the faith of a Queen I promise to exonerate you in due time

[1] *Labanoff*, v, 5, p. 389.

and place, that whoever, without any exception, has said or caused to be said, that between my said keeper and me, or otherwise in any sort whatsoever, there has passed the least thing in the world contrary or prejudicial to my honour, he has falsely and villainously lied, and will lie, all and as many times as he shall say it, or cause it to be said."[1]

This letter found its way in due course to M. de Mauvissière, and the original is preserved among the public archives at Paris.[2] A second, a secret, and more interesting letter, dated January 5th, was intercepted by Walsingham, deciphered by his agents, and a contemporary copy is now in the Public Record Office.[3] The portion of it relating to the Countess of Shrewsbury may be translated as follows:—

"I wrote to you last Thursday, openly, about this false and unhappy imposture, which they have made up against me, between the Earl of Shrewsbury and me, of which I pray you again to speak to this Queen, and to all those of her Council everywhere, as loudly as you can, and to publish my offers on the subject and their answers, in order to counterwork the false reports which you have informed me that they already have spread. You will have been able to understand by my said letters my intention to implicate indirectly the Countess of Shrewsbury, against whom, if I am once without fear of opening my mouth, I feel sure that she and all her courtiers would have reason to repent having so cruelly and traitorously attacked me: for I have already in writing certain acts and practices of her and her people to reveal, wherein the Earl of Leicester and others of the faction are very deeply compromised: and if the Queen of England once knows it, I do not think she will ever be able to trust in them. It will not be at all out of place for you to declare indirectly to the said Earl of Leicester that you have formerly heard it said by some one of my servants, passing through this kingdom, that the said Countess had revealed to

[1] Mary to Mauvissière, Jan. 2.—*Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 392.
[2] *Colbert MSS.*, No. 470, fol. 27. [3] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. XIII., No. 1.

me very great secrets of the said Earl, as well about his most private conduct with the Queen of England, as of his designs and schemes in this kingdom: and upon that you will be able to advise him not to push me further, so as to drive me to extremity.

"I do not doubt that, among these disputings, Walsingham will retain in his hands my packets and yours, as long as he is able; and for this reason, take occasion to write to me as often as you are able, as I will do the same towards you. Ask to have my said letters of the 2nd of this month by way of enquiring if now I have not made any answer to your previous communications, and that you wish to hear news of me and my circumstances and health, to render an account of them to the King, your master. By the carrier I find it in nowise safe to write, unless all other means fail: in which event, the best and most secret writing is with alum dissolved in a very little clear water twenty-four hours before you wish to write: and to read it, it is necessary only to dip the paper into a basin of clear water; the secret writing appears white, very easily read until the paper becomes dry again; you can in this way write on white taffeta, or white cloth, especially lawn: and, that it may be known between us when there is anything written, it will be necessary to cut from the piece of taffeta or lawn a small bit out of one of the corners. As for the papers which are commonly memorials, write the letter M of this word memoire, with the tail reversed, in this manner ꟽ ꟽ. I shall adopt the same course if necessity requires it; but we must not avail ourselves of it except for an occasion of great importance; and besides, take care to name nobody whosoever, so as not to be endangered by it."

The threats of retaliation on the Countess of Shrewsbury here expressed add significance to, and throw light on the question of the famous scandal letter addressed to Queen Elizabeth which we shall have presently to discuss. For the moment, however, let us notice other indications of Mary's hot indignation against her slanderous assailant.

"If the Queen of England," she says, on the 26th February, "does not have this calumny cleared up, I shall be obliged openly to attack the Countess of Shrewsbury herself. . . . Whatever may befal, there is nothing that I would not venture to clear my honour, which, to say nothing of my exalted station, is more precious to me than a thousand lives."[1] Again, on the 21st March, Mary says:—

"I would wish you to mention privately to the Queen (obtaining, if possible, her promise neither to communicate it to anyone, nor to make any further enquiry) that nothing has alienated the Countess of Shrewsbury from me but the vain hope, which she has conceived, of setting the crown of England on the head of her little girl Arabella, and this by means of marrying her to a son of the Earl of Leicester. These children are also educated in this idea; and their portraits have been sent to each other."

Further, the Queen of Scots asserts that the Countess of Shrewsbury had promised if ever her life was in danger to provide means for her escape, and Charles Cavendish resided in London for no other purpose than to acquaint Mary with all that passed there. "I could also," she adds, "if I pleased, bring her into great trouble, as her people have, by her express orders, brought me cyphers, and she has also delivered me some with her own hands."[2]

[1] Mary to Mauvissière, Feb. 26.—*Strickland*, v. 2, p. 86.

[2] Mary to Mauvissière, March 21, 1584.—*Strickland*, v. 2, p. 95.

As an example of the state of the family relations among the Talbots at this time, and also as an indication that the Queen of Scots was a cause aggravating, if not creating, the discord, I quote the following letter from a servant of Lady Shrewsbury's, which fell, like so many other documents, into the hands of Walsingham:—

Fraunces Battell to Lady Eliz. Paullat.

"My Lady (Countess of Shrewsbury) commends her to your ladyship. I have sent you a pair of knives, and beseech you to accept my good will herein.

Let us now turn to the "scandal letter," the natural outcome of the threats already uttered. It is preserved among the Cecil papers at Hatfield, the property of the Marquis of Salisbury, and, like other documents distasteful to the supporters of Mary Stuart, has been summarily dismissed as a forgery. But what says Prince Labanoff, who, though a devoted admirer of Mary Stuart, is too candid a student of history to take refuge under a convenient but false subterfuge. Prince Labanoff admits that the letter is genuine, though he doubts whether it ever reached the hands of Elizabeth, and says:—

"This letter is so extraordinary that many historians have maintained that it was of doubtful authenticity; but it is impossible to maintain this opinion seriously, since the original, long known, has never left the archives of Lord Burleigh's family. It is a very fine autograph letter. I examined and

Mr. Lewes is my great enemy, and hath abused my lady, and is most hatefully bent against me. My Lord gives out hard speech of me to my great discredit, if it were believed by my friends, among whom I make most account of you. 'The case of my lord's hard dealing with me is that the Scottish Queen cannot abide me, for how can she abide me when she is with all hatred bent against my good lady and mistress. I have been plain with the Scots, and since that time my lord doth not like of me, but is with all hatred bent against me. The words that the Scottish Queen's servants said to me and to others of my lord's servants, were these, but none made answer but I. This said they, that the Scottish Queen should be Queen of England. Whereto I made this answer, that it were better that the Scottish Queen were hanged before that time should come to pass, and all that so thought.' I made this answer rashly, it grieved me so to hear these words; and I am bound in duty and conscience so to answer. I have attended my lady these two years, and she likes well my services. Would be most heartily sorry to part with her, but if my lord continues his hard speech, I can abide it no longer. He only wrote one letter to my lady this half year, and that was all of me, that it was a shame for her to keep me, with many other words that is too much to write of. 'And one of my offences that my lord doth allege to me is this, because I did pity my honourable lady's and Mrs. cause of grief, which is to be pitied, and lamentable it is. God amend it in his good time. Chacworth, 23 March."

Holograph, p. 1. *Addressed.* "To the right worshepp, and my very good lady, the lady Elizabeth Paullat, at Clartonwell."

Endorsed by Burleigh. "xi. Aprill, 1584. To the Lady Paulett, from one Francisce Battell, a gentlewoman of the Countess of Shrewsbury's."

Another Endorsement. "From Mrs. Battell. Came to my hands by one of Mrs. Wynckfeld's men. 11 April."—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. XIII., No. 14.

collated it last year in the valuable collection of the Marquis of Salisbury, known as the Cecil papers, and I am thoroughly convinced that it has been entirely written by the hand of Mary Stuart. Nor ought that to astonish us, since, in many of the preceding letters, the Queen of Scots is careful to announce this letter several times beforehand, in constantly reiterating her threats to reveal all that the Countess of Shrewsbury had said to her on the subject of Elizabeth. Now, the authenticity of the document being established, there remains another question for us to examine, that is, whether the original of this letter ever reached the hands of the Queen of England. For myself, I do not think it did, and I found my opinion on the matter upon the silence maintained by all the correspondence of the time relative to so strange an event, and which would naturally have had the most terrible consequences. Admitting this hypothesis, we must conclude either that Lord Burghley intercepted this famous letter when Mary Stuart addressed it to Elizabeth, or else that Mary Stuart did not decide to send it, and that it was found, in 1586, among the papers of the Queen of Scots when they were seized at Chartley, at the time of the Babington conspiracy."[1]

This letter has been quoted wholly or in part by many writers, and my first intention was to omit it from this volume. But it is impossible to discuss the questions that arise as to its date and authenticity without having the letter before us. I therefore copy it from Labanoff, v. 6, p. 51 :—

" Madame, suivant ce que je vous ay promis et avvez despuis désiré, je vous déclare, ores qu'avecques regret que telles choses soyent ammenées en questions, mais très sincèrement et sans aucqune passion, dont j'appelle mon Dieu à tesmoing, que la comptesse de Srewsbury m'a dit de vous ce qui suit au plus près de ces termes. A la plupart de quoy je proteste avoir respondu, reprenant la ditte dame de croire ou parler si lissentieusement de vous, comme chose que je ne croyois point, ny

[1] *Labanoff*, v. 6, p. 56.

croy à présent, cognoissant le naturel de la comptesse et de quel esprit elle estoit alors poulssée contre vous.

"Premièrement, qu'un,[1] auquel elle disoit que vous aviez faict promesse de mariage devant une dame de vostre chambre, avoit couché infinies foys avvesques vous, avecque toute la licence et privaulté qui se peut user entre mari et famme; mais qu'indubitablement vous n'estiez pas comme les aultres femmes, et pour ce respect c'estoit follie à tous ceulx qu'affectoient vostre mariage avec M. le duc d'Anjou, d'aultant qu'il ne se pourroit accomplir, et que vous ne vouldriez jamais perdre la liberté de vous fayre fayre l'amour et avoir vostre plésir tousjours avecques nouveaulx amoureulx, regrettant, ce disoit elle, que vous ne vous contentiez de maister Haton et un aultre de ce royaulme; mays que, pour l'honneur du pays, il lui fashoit le plus que vous aviez non seulement engagé vostre honneur avvecques un estrangier nommé Simier, l'alant trouver de nuit en la chambre d'une dame, que la dicte comtesse blasmoit fort à ceste occasion là, où vous le baisiez et usiez avec luy de diverses privautez déshonestes; mays aussi luy révelliez les segretz du royaulme, trahisant vos propres conseillers avvecques luy. Que vous vous estiés desportée de la mesme dissolution avvec le Duc son maystre, qui vous avoit esté trouver une nuit à la porte de vostre chambre, où vous l'aviez rencontré avvec vostre seulle chemise et manteau de nuit, et que par après vous l'aviez laissé entrer, et qu'il demeura avvecques vous près de troys heures. Quant au dit Haton, que vous le couriez à force; faysant si publiquement paroître l'amour que luy portiez, que luy mesmes estoit contraint de s'en retirer, et que vous donnastes un soufflet à Killegrev, pour ne vous avoir ramené le dit Haton que vous aviez envoyé rappeller par luy, s'estant desparti en chollère d'avvecques vous, pour quelques injures que luy avviez ditte pour certeins boutons d'or qu'il avvoit sur son habit. Qu'elle avoit travaillé de fayre espouser au dict Haton la feu comtesse de Lenox, sa fille,[2] mays que de creinte de vous il n'i osoit entendre; que mesme le comte d'Oxfort n'osoit ce rappointer avecque sa famme, de peur de

[1] The Earl of Leicester.

[2] Elizabeth, Countess of Lennox, daughter of Lady Shrewsbury.

perdre la faveur qu'il espéroit recepvoir pour vous fayre l'amour: que vous estiez prodigue envers toutes telles gens et ceulx qui se mesloient de telles mesnées; comme à un de vostre chambre, Gorges, auquel vous avviez donné troys centz ponds de rente, pour vous avvoir apporté les nouvelles du retour de Hatton: qu'à toutz aultres vous estiez fort ingrate, chische, et qu'il n'y avoit que troys ou quatre en vostre royaulme à qui vous ayez jamays faict bien. Me conseillant, en riant extresmement, mettre mon filz sur les rancs pour vous fayre l'amours, comme chose qui me serviroyt grandement, et mettroit monsieur le Duc hors de quartier, qui me seroit très préjudisiable si il y continuoit; et lui répliquant que cela seroyt pris pour une vraye mocquerie, elle me respondit que vous estiez si vayne et en si bonne opinion de vostre beauté, comme si vous estiez quelque déesse du ciel, qu'elle prendroit sur la teste de le vous faire croire facillement, et entretiendroit mon filz en ceste humeur.

"Que vous preniez sy grand plésir en flatteries hors de toute raysons que l'on vous disoit, comme de dire, qu'on ne vous osoit par foys reguarder à plain, d'aultant que vostre face luysoit comme le soleill, qu'elle et toustes les aultres dames de la cour estoints constreintes d'en user ainsi; et qu'en son dernier voyage vers vous, elle et la feue comtesse de Lenox, parlant à vous, n'osoient s'entreregarder l'une et l'autre de peur de s'éclater de rire des cassades qu'elles vous donnoint, me priant à son retour de tancer sa fille qu'elle n'avoyt jamays sceu persuader d'en fayre de mesme; et quand à sa fille Talbot,[1] elle s'assuroyt qu'elle ne fauldroyt jamays de vous rire au nez. La dicte dame Talbot, lorsqu'elle vous alla fayre la révérance et donné le serment comme l'une de vos servantes, à son retour immédiatement, me la comtant comme une chose fayte en mocquerie, me pria de l'accepter pareill, mays plus ressent et entier vers moy, duquel je feiz long-temps refus; mays à la fin, à force de larmes, je la laissay fayre, disant qu'elle ne vouldroit pour chose au monde estre en vostre service près de vostre personne, d'autant qu'elle avoit peur que, quand seriez en cholère, ne luy fissiez comme à sa cousine Skedmur, à qui vous

[1] Mary, wife of Gilbert Talbot.

avviez rompu un doibt, faciant à croyre à ceulx de la court que c'estoit un chandellier qui estoit tombé dessubz; et qu' à une aultre, vous servant à table, avviez donné un grand coup de cousteau sur la mayn: en un mot, pour ces derniers pointz et communs petits rapportz, croyez que vous estiez jouée et contrefaicte par elles comme en commédie, entre mes fammes mesmes; ce qu'appercevant, je vous jure que je deffendis à mes fammes de ne ce plus mesler.

"Davantasge la dicte comtesse m'a autrefoys advertie que vous voulliez appointer Rolson, pour me fayre l'amour et essayer de me déshonorer, soyt en effect ou par mauvais bruit, de quoy il avoyt instructions de vostre bousche propre: que Ruxby veint ici, il y a environ viij ans, pour atempter à ma vie, ayant parlé à vous-mesme, qui luy avviez dit qu'il fist ce à quoi Walsingham luy commanderoit et dirigeroit. Quand la dicte comtesse poursuivoit le mariage de son filz Charles[1] avecque une des niepces de milord Paget, et que d'aultre part vous voulliez l'avoir par pure et absolue aucthorité pour un des Knolles, pour ce qu'il estoit vostre parent; elle crioit fort contre vous, et disoit que c'estoit une vraye tyrannie, voulant à vostre fantasie enlever toutes les héritières du pays, et que vous aviez indignement usé le dict Paget par parolles injurieuses; mays qu'enfin, la noblesse de ce royaulme ne le vous souffriroit pas, mesmement si vous [vous] adressiez à telz aultres qu'elle connoissoit bien.

"Il y a environ quatre ou sinq ans que, vous estant malade et moy aussy au mesme temps, elle me dit que vostre mal provenoit de la closture d'une fistulle que vous aviez dans une jambe; et que sans doubte, venant à perdre vos moys, vous mourriez bientost, s'en resjouissant sur une vayne imagination qu'elle a eue de long-temps par les prédictions d'un nommé John Lenton, et d'un vieulx livvre qui prédisoit vostre mort par violence, et la succession d'un aultre royne, qu'elle interprêtoit estre moy, regrettant seullement que par le dict livvre, il estoit prédit que la royne qui vous debvroit succéder, ne règneroit que trois ans, et mourroit comme vous par violence,

[1] Charles Cavendish.

ce qui estoit représenté mesme en peinture dans le dict livvre, auquel il y avoit un dernier feuillet, le contenu duquel elle ne m'a jamays voulu dire. Elle sçait mesme que j'ay tousjours pris cela pour une pure follie, mays elle fesoit si bien son compte d'estre la première auprès de moy, et mesmement que mon filz épouseroit ma niepce Arbella.[1]

"Pour la fin, je vous jure encore un coup, sur ma foy et mon honneur, que ce que desubz est très véritable, et que, de ce qui conserne vostre honneur, il ne m'est jamays tombé en l'entendement, de vous fayre tort par le réveller, et qu'il ne ce sçaura jamays par moy, le tenant pour très faulx. Si je puys avoir cest heur de parler à vous, je vous diray plus particulièrement les noms, tems, lieux et aultres circonstances, pour vous fayre cognoistre la vérité et de cessi et d'aultres choses que je réserve, quant je seray tout à fayct asseurée de vostre amitié; laquelle comme je désire plus que jamays, aussi, si je la puis ceste foys obtenir, vous n'eustes jamays parente, amye, ni mesme subjet, plus fidelle et affectionné que je vous la seray. Pour Dieu, asseurez vous de celle qui vous veult et peult servir.

"De mon lit, forçant mon bras et mes douleurs pour vous satisfayre et obéir.

"Marie R."

Mr. Hunter, who was no enemy to the Queen of Scots, but a very painstaking historian, feels constrained to add his testimony to the genuineness of the letter; but he assigns its date, not with Murdin, to 1586, but to August or September of 1582. The date was certainly not 1586; nor does it altogether accord with events of 1582. Labanoff assigns it to November, 1584; but it seems to agree so exactly with the situation in the spring of that year, when Mary had been threatening reprisals on the Countess of Shrewsbury for her shameful

[1] Arabella Stuart, daughter of Charles, Earl of Lennox, and his wife Elizabeth, daughter of Lady Shrewsbury.

slanders, that we have little hesitation in regarding it as a production of April or May, 1584. In 1586, Mary Stuart had been for two years away from the custody of the Earl of Shrewsbury, and, during the summer of that year, was deeply engaged in the Babington conspiracy; circumstances that make it scarcely likely she would be then giving vent to her spleen against the Countess of Shrewsbury, or that she would venture to draw Elizabeth's wrath upon herself, and possibly increase the vigilance with which she was guarded.

The internal evidence of the letter entirely agrees with the date we have ventured to assign. Mary speaks of Elizabeth's projected marriage with the Duke of Anjou, sometimes spoken of by his other title as Duke of Alençon, referring to him as a living person, and Anjou died on the 10th June, 1584. Again, the Queen of Scots, in referring to her relative Elizabeth, Countess of Lennox, speaks of her as "the late Countess of Lennox," a perfectly correct description, for this daughter of the Countess of Shrewsbury died at Sheffield on Sunday, 21st January, 1582, and was buried in the Shrewsbury vault in Sheffield Parish Church. Furthermore, she uses this phrase, "*que Ruxby veint ici, il y a environ viij ans*," &c. "Ici" must mean Sheffield, for at no other place in England did Mary reside for eight years. The phrase is inconsistent with Prince Labanoff's date of November, 1584, for Mary was then at Wingfield, whither she was removed in September, after having been absent from that mansion fifteen years. The phrase, moreover,

does not harmonize with Murdin's suggestion of 1586, a year in which, from January to September, Mary was at Chartley, and from September and forward at Fotheringay. The letter, moreover, is written "*de mon lit forçant mon bras et mes douleurs pour vous satisfayre et obéir.*" On the 13th May, 1584, Beale arrived at Sheffield to treat with the Queen of Scots, but his interview was postponed till the next day, "by reason of her indisposition. She had been troubled with a looseness for eight days and kept her chamber."[1] In May then, while suffering from sickness and treating with Elizabeth's representatives, this remarkable epistle may have been penned. It was indeed a bitter reprisal on the Countess of Shrewsbury. That it may have been sent by one Queen to another affords a striking illustration of the moralities and decencies of the times. The training Mary Stuart received in France initiated her into all the debaucheries and villainy of that profligate Court; nor were the characteristics of the Court of the "Virgin Queen" Arcadian. There was a coarseness of language and of manners that was repulsive, mingled with an affectation of refinement clothed in hyperbolic compliment, making pretence to romance and chivalry, but concealing the putrefaction of utter immorality. Of the scandal that called forth this retort, we have not heard the last. After Mary had left Sheffield to pass into the care of other hands, we shall find Shrewsbury taking steps to protect his reputation

[1] Beale and Shrewsbury to Walsingham, May 16.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. xiii., No. 28.

and punish his assailants, by a prosecution at the Middlesex Sessions; and the Countess of Shrewsbury, with her two sons, were compelled to protest their belief in the chaste and honourable conduct of the Queen of Scots, and their disbelief in the scandalous reports spread abroad against her.[1]

In the letter from the Queen of Scots to M. de Mauvissière, dated January 5th, 1584, which has been already referred to [ante page 549] Mary most emphatically denied all knowledge of the plots then on hand. She says the more her enemies look into the matter the more certainly will they discover her complete innocence, especially as to the pretended conspiracy of Somerville, whose name, nor the name of any other condemned for the same thing, she was prepared to take a solemn oath, and protest before God, that she had never heard named.[2] This is emphatic language, but not too emphatic for the Queen of Scots, when overdoing the part of innocence. Her letter fell into Walsingham's hands, as did also another addressed by Charles Paget to the Queen of Scots, in which he narrated for her information the proceedings against Lord Paget, Throckmorton, and himself, together with an account of the "murder" of Somerville—men of whose very names Mary professed to be ignorant. Can we wonder that with such information as this, information coming not from one source but from many, that Queen Elizabeth should speak in such terms as the following to the French Ambassador:—

[1] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. xiv., No. 111.

[2] Mary to Mauvissière, Jan. 5.—*Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 400.

"She then said to me that your letter was full of great offers of friendship, as well as that of the Queen, your mother, except that, towards the conclusion, it made mention of the Queen of Scotland, whose name seems to give her great vexation, saying that if she had had to do with any other, she should long since not have been living; that she had held conference in England with her rebels, another at Rouen, another in Paris, another in Rome, another in Spain, and had set on foot intrigues against her throughout all Christendom; that she held prisoners some of her couriers and messengers who had disclosed more of her secrets, which were in the end to take away her kingdom and her life, if she could, but rather by means of the King of Spain than by yours; and she hoped your Majesty would deliver up to her all her traitors and rebels within your kingdom, especially Lord Paget, and his brother, and Lord Arundel, and some others of their accomplices."[1]

On the 28th January, the Queen of Scots addressed to M. de Mauvissière a long letter, going over a great deal of old ground, about the negotiations with Elizabeth, and with the Scotch faction that controlled King James. She expressed entire confidence in the zeal of Mauvissière, and spoke of the pressure he ought to bring to bear on Elizabeth in order to obtain reparation for the calumnies spread against Mary Stuart, as to her relations with the Earl of Shrewsbury. The project of Shrewsbury's visit to Court was again being mooted, and Mary urged M. de Mauvissière to seek some modification of the treatment she had to submit to during Lord Shrewsbury's absence, and impressed upon him the opposition he ought to offer, in the name of the King his master, to her being placed, even temporarily, under the care of one of her

[1] Mauvissière to Henry III., Jan. 17.—*Strickland*, v. 2, p. 55, where the date is erroneously given as 1583. The internal evidence of the letter itself fixes the year as 1584.

personal enemies. Unless this were attended to, her life would be actually in danger, and a grave responsibility would rest on the head of Elizabeth.

Again the Queen of Scots protested that she had never heard the names of the conspirators Somerville and Arden. Mauvissière was to assure Elizabeth that Mary Stuart would share the disgrace of the condemnation of these men if it could be proved that she had had the least intelligence with them.[1] This, and a great deal more, the Lady at Sheffield wrote to the French Ambassador, and her communications were laid before Elizabeth, with the effect of eliciting the following answer from the Queen, addressed to the Earl of Shrewsbury:—

"We find by a letter from the Scotch Queen to the French Ambassador, that she desired him to declare three special matters to us.

"1. Touching the late Treaty, wherein she labours greatly to set out her own sincerity, not without some touch to us in not following her advice.

"2. Concerning certain lewd and most reproachable speeches against her.

"3. She seems to fear some peril by the choice of the party to whose custody she might be committed, if you had our licence to repair to us.

"To these we answer: (1.) If her doings had agreed with her protestation, the treaty would long ago have taken issue, as she desired. While it was in hand, her son, directed by her advice as she protested, tried to remove from himself all who were any way affected to us, and has since committed some and banished others. We also heard from abroad how earnestly her ministers concurred with our rebels and others, under colour of advancing the Catholic religion, to provoke the Pope and other princes to attempt something against the realm.

[1] Mary to Mauvissière, Jan. 28.—*Labanoff*, v. 5, pp. 407-422.

This has appeared from George Throckmorton's confession. We know also that if the French King had allowed her friends and allies in France to have proceeded in their preparations, both Scotland and England had tasted trouble, wherein the attempters would have received small honour and less profit. All this shows that her intention was to lull us into security, that we might the less seek to discover practices at home and abroad. We think it strange that in her letters to the Ambassador, she showed herself to be so free from knowledge of these things, as faulty persons oft seek to excuse themselves before they are declared guilty. This strange and unsound manner of proceeding might give us just cause to forbear to listen to any like motion, but if she will remove these causes of jealousy, by directing her son to take another course than he has lately done by her advice (which will be honourable to her and profitable to him), and by directing her ministers to forbear the wicked and malicious courses into which they have entered, and to cut off all concurrence with our rebels and disaffected subjects, she shall then find us ready to perform whatever she can with honour and reason demand.

"This will be more profitable for her than the extravagant courses she has lately held.

"We doubt not, through God's goodness, who has preserved us as miraculously as any other prince who ever occupied this place, but that we shall be able to withstand the malice of our enemies, both at home and abroad.

"To the second point, we can neither forget her quality nor her proximity in blood. We have always had special care to suppress the licentiousness of this corrupt age in speaking evil of princes, whose credit and reputation ought to be held sacred. If we had received information of the place and persons by whom such speeches were uttered, we would not have omitted exemplary punishment, and will do so when we receive knowledge of the guilty parties.

"To the third point: if she considers the course of our government hitherto, which has been free from blemish of such touch as she fears, or our usage towards her since she has been in England, and how much it would touch us in reputation,

which we esteem dearer than life, even though we had no regard to her, she may be sure that we cannot but have special care to act in accordance with our honour and her safety.

"Westm. 8 March, 1583[4], 26 Eliz."[1]

This was not the kind of answer sought for by the Queen of Scots. It was evident Elizabeth and her ministers knew more of her proceedings with Paget and Throckmorton than was quite convenient, or even desirable, from Mary's point of view. When Elizabeth's letter reached Sheffield, Shrewsbury declared its contents to the Scotch Queen. "She answered that Mildmay, Beale, and Shrewsbury were witnesses that in due time she had discharged herself of the treaty, having always protested that all she said and did should be void if she had not a resolution within twenty days after Mildmay's departure, and that since then she had never heard word of her Majesty's resolution."

Shrewsbury answered, "this was an artifice to discharge herself of what she knew would fall out in Scotland;" whereupon Mary fell into a long and uninteresting discourse about Scotch affairs, the doings of her son, and of Elizabeth, mingled with protestations of her own good and pure intentions.

"She was much offended," continues Shrewsbury, "when I said that the proposed treaty had no other end but to lull you into security. Calling upon God, she said she knew who was both the luller and the lulled, referring either part to his judgment. She received very thankfully the assurance I gave her of your favour. Reminded her of your graciousness towards her and her son, and her ability to do them good or harm as they shall deserve, and your power to withstand your enemies.

[1] *Draft, pp.* 5. *Endd.—MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. XIII., No. 5.

For my own part I, and 200,000 more, should be ready to hazard life and all else in that behalf. You would, however, from your regard to her and her son, grant any reasonable requests.

"She said that she would write to you herself, but she would never again enter into any treaty without good assurance from yourself.

"She took very well your answer to the second and third points, but talking further of these bruits, she glanced many words against some whom she said she would name when better time should serve; marvelling much that as I was touched in the same, I did not labour to make the truth thereof appear better, 'defying me withal what I have seen or known of her behaviour.' Replied that I always had done and always would do the part of a noble man according to my duty to your Majesty, and my respect for the truth, which indeed I will take upon my allegiance to make appear before you and in the face of all my adversaries. I will let you know the falsehood of the other reports and treacheries towards me as soon as you will grant me my so 'long procured' request, to come to your presence.

"Thanks the Queen for the assurance which she shows she has in him. Sheffield Castle, 23 March, 1583[4]."[1]

Not content to leave her case entirely in the hands of Lord Shrewsbury, the Queen of Scots wrote letters to Mauvissière[2] and to Queen Elizabeth. To the latter, after reference to her conversations with Lord Shrewsbury, and expressions of her strong desire that the authors of the slanders against her should be sought out, Mary protests that the rupture of the late negotiation, about the the treaty of alliance, ought not to be imputed to her. She had always placed her hope in the pro-

[1] Shrewsbury to Elizabeth.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. XIII., No. 13.

[2] Mary to Mauvissière, March 22.—*Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 440.

tection of Elizabeth, and now entreated her to take up again the interrupted negotiation.[1]

This entreaty had its effect, as we shall presently see; but for the moment the resumption of negotiations was delayed by Shrewsbury's desire to go up to Court and clear his character from the slanders under which he suffered in common with his Charge. The Queen of Scots had written in February: "The Earl of Shrewsbury, I understand, is more than ever resolved to visit the Court, in order to enquire into the accusations of his enemies; I doubt not he will prove his innocence, to their confusion and his own honour."[2]

On the 20th March, Shrewsbury's desire had so far commended itself to Queen Elizabeth that she caused instructions to be drawn up, addressed to Shrewsbury, Sir Ralph Sadler, and Sir Henry Nevill, expressing her intention to grant release to Shrewsbury, and remove the Queen of Scots to Melbourne Castle, in Derbyshire.[3] On the same day, orders were drafted for Sir Ralph Sadler, telling him how to proceed on taking charge of the Queen of Scots.[4] Lord Burghley drew up with his own hand a list

[1] Mary to Elizabeth, March 22.—*Labanoff*, v. 5, p. 446.

[2] Mary to Mauvissière, Feb. 26.—*Strickland*, v. 2, p, 89.

[3] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. XIII., No. 7.

[4] "Instructions for Sir Rafe Sadler.

"He is to take charge of the Queen of Scots, as Shrewsbury is coming to the Queen's presence.

"He is directed to learn from the Earl what order has been observed for her safe keeping, and to make any necessary alterations in consequence of the difference of their positions—the Earl having kept her with his own men, and Sadler having to keep her with the Earl's men. The Earl must have special care in choosing the servants to leave behind him, that they are men well affected in religion, of good wealth, *and void of corruption.* He must bring up those who were familiar with her servants, *as many must have been allured by them to be more favourable than would be convenient in his absence.*

"Sadler must curtail the liberty enjoyed by her servants, restrain the laun-

of the names of persons living near Melbourne, as a reminder of the neighbours the Queen of Scots was likely to have;[1] and on the 1st April, a draft was prepared of the formal order for Shrewsbury's release from his long and arduous charge. It was as follows:—

"Queen Elizabeth to Shrewsbury.

"As you have been a long and earnest suitor to be released from the custody of the Scottish Queen, wherein you have served us most faithfully, we release you from the charge, and have chosen Sir Ralph Sadler and Sir Henry Nevill to supply your place, according to instructions sent to you and them. As the Queen may conceive that we intend by this removing to subject her to harder usage than before, and that the treaty dealt in last summer shall be void of all hope of further proceedings, you shall tell her that though some things lately discovered may minister just cause of both, as we dare make herself the judge when she understands them, we shall rather follow our own disposition, which is no way inclined to extre-

dresses and others who have been accustomed to go into the town of Sheffield, and other places. *He must tell the Earl that, being a stranger, he must be the more curious during his absence than would be otherwise necessary, considering the awe his servants bear him.*

"Wishes the Queen, if possible, to be removed to Wynckfeld, *that her servants may have less acquaintance with the country round.*

"The Queen must not be allowed to ride far abroad, but only, on foot or in a coach, to take the air and use exercise near the house.

"The watches kept in towns and villages near must be increased, if Sadler and the Earl think fit. Should be kept in towns and villages farther off than before, and kept both day and night. Men of best wealth and substance, *and least void of suspicion of being corrupted*, should be chosen for this duty in each place. The justices must take order that no rogues or masterless persons be allowed in the neighbourhood of the Queen. The head officers of the towns shall deliver to the justices notes of the strangers who nightly lodge therein. Suspicious strangers must be presented to the justices, and Sadler informed thereof. Desires Sadler to send a copy of the orders to which he and the Earl agree.

"On going to the Queen he shall tell her, that the Queen has chosen him to fill Shrewsbury's place during his absence, and has charged him to have special care of her safety, and to see her used with proper respect. If she mentions the late treaty concerning increase of liberty, he must say, that he knows nothing of it, as the instructions were sent to him by Sommer when absent from Court, but he supposes she will receive an answer on the Earl's return."

Draft. The passages in italics are corrections by Cecil.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. xiii., No. 9.

[1] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. xiii., No. 10.

mity, than look upon her deserts. If we receive due satisfaction from her, she shall find us disposed to yield that contentment, as she shall have no cause to mislike. For her better satisfaction, you shall show her these letters. Westm., 1 April, 1584. 26 Eliz.[1]"

These arrangements, however, were not carried out. For some reason not disclosed, Elizabeth was pleased to renew the negotiations about the treaty, and on the 18th April, William Waad, one of the clerks of the Council, was sent to Sheffield, ostensibly to attend on M. Maron, Seneschal of Poitou, who was charged with the settlement of certain private matters between the Queen of Scots and the Duke of Joyeuse, relative to her dowry lands in France.

Waad and Maron arrived in Sheffield on Wednesday, April 23rd, reported themselves to the Earl of Shrewsbury, and delivered the Queen's letters. The Earl asked them to dine with him next day, intending, by an honourable entertainment of Maron, to make him less discontented with the scanty privileges of intercourse to which it was designed to restrict him.

Next day, after dinner, Shrewsbury sent for the two envoys, and brought them to the presence of the Queen of Scots. Secretary Nau received them in the ante-chamber, embraced the French gentleman, and fell presently into conference, which Shrewsbury forbade. M. Maron excused his freedom on the ground of an old acquaintance with Nau, whom he was glad to see; but Waad strongly advised him to take no liberties, lest he should cause suspicion and provoke the Earl.

[1] *Draft. MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. xiii., No. 15.

On entering the Queen's chamber, the two envoys did reverence to her Majesty, and at Shrewsbury's desire Waad declared the cause of their coming. He explained that M. Maron was sent at the request of the French King to deal about the releasing of certain duties from lands of Queen Mary's dowry, which the Duke of Joyeuse was about to purchase; and for himself, Mr. Waad said, he came because the French King asked that a servant of Queen Elizabeth's might accompany Maron, that there might be no suspicion of dealing other than princely. Thereupon M. Maron was formally presented to the Queen of Scots, and she addressed to him, besides complimentary enquiries, an earnest request to be informed of any news from her son, as she had no other means to hear from him. Maron said that he heard from Mauvissière that her son was in good health.

The matter of business about the dowry was soon settled, for Mary referred the details to her Secretary, saying she never understood matters of that kind, but stood to the report of her officers; if he would therefore instruct her Secretary, she would be ready to yield anything in the Duke's favour. Turning towards Waad, Mary began in bitter words to complain of her hard usage, after seeking the Queen's favour by all means possible, and submitting herself far more than became her calling. Waad desired her to speak in English, which she knew very well, and his lordship understood best.

"Well," quoth she, "Mr. Waad, I will first answer what you say. The Queen, my good sister, doth

know those means I do use to have intelligence which she easily may do, for in good faith I have none at all. And my lord here knoweth, if he were examined upon his conscience, how I have used all means I could to assure the Queen of the soundness of my meaning." Mary spoke of the treaty begun, referring her dealing therein to the consciences of Shrewsbury, Mildmay and Beale, calling God to witness that she proceeded in all sincerity, and that her Majesty broke it off, whereby she felt greatly aggrieved and deluded, and would make the French King judge of her actions.

Waad quite understood what he was to do. He had only been deputed, he said, to wait on the French gentleman, yet it did happen that he had heard from Queen Elizabeth the reason of the breaking off of the negotiations, and that was the agreement between her son and herself to enter the the treaty jointly, which he refused to do, and took so contrary a course that it seemed as if the Queen of Scots only wished to amuse Elizabeth to gain time for her son to work the alteration he intended.

Mary answered that she was charged with things contrary, with governing her son, and that he did what she directed, and yet that she could not make him enter into the treaty with her, which did not stand to reason.

"Nay, good Mr. Waad, for God's sake, lay either t'one or the other to my charge, for both cannot be; but I know there is no fault in the Queen, my good sister, with whom, if I might obtain leave to speak withal, I should satisfy to her contentment of the soundness of my meaning."

Waad defended his mistress from this charge of inconsistency, and Mary replied, saying:—

"She was not as eloquent in my tongue as I was, but she meant truth, and had said that if her son did not confirm it in twenty days, all the conference should be void, protesting, with all sincerity, before God and her salvation, that she dealt with all soundness and integrity. 'But,' quoth she, 'I remember what the Queen of England wrote with a diamond when she was in prison:—

'Much suspected by me,
But nothing proved can be.

So whatsoever is done in the realm or without, the Queen of Scots doth it.' She complained bitterly of having been kept sixteen years in prison, having, before she came into the realm, the Queen's promise of protection; she was grown old in prison, her legs were scarce able to bear her, her health impaired, her honour defamed, so that nobody durst pity her, that she sought the Queen's favour by all means, being an absolute Queen as well as she, and her nearest kinswoman, using bitter speeches of her misery."

Waad was sorry to see her break out in such terms against the Queen, and said so. He magnified Elizabeth's clemency, and said "we had seen in our times contrary behaviour for much smaller offences."

"She entered into extreme choler, because I spoke of mercy, saying that she was an absolute prince as well as the Queen, and not her inferior, born from her cradle to be Queen, and afterwards, Queen by participation of France, the greatest realm in Christendom. Her Majesty had mercy for her subjects, but used all extremity to her, and that she did not maintain rebels against their sovereign, as her Majesty did."

Waad declared this statement a manifest and foul slander, and expressed a wish that Mary were as able to clear herself from partaking in rebellion as Elizabeth was from maintaining the rebels of others. There was further discourse, and at length Mary

said :—Three things she would not allow to be injured, her honour, her right to the succession, and her son, whom she tended with motherly love and affection. Waad indulged his hearer with some more high flown sentiments, and Mary remarked, though she was younger in years than her Majesty, she was older to look to: God would revenge her on her enemies as He had already done on most of them, whom she stuck not to curse.

Then followed more lecturing and good advice from Mr. Waad, for which Mary thanked him, but could not brook the reasons, repeating her griefs, her woeful state, and the care of her son, whom she wished to depend chiefly upon the Queen. Waad tried to be persuasive, if not eloquent, and wound up one of his preachments with the very true remark, "We have so many conspiracies against the Queen since you have been in England, that only God's favour has preserved her." After some further talk, the Queen of Scots answered very resolutely that she was fully resolved, and little or nothing esteemed her life, after so long captivity; that her ambition was quite quenched; her only care was her son; she had told the Queen what would happen if she broke off the treaty; she would not be to blame for what would happen there or elsewhere through her ministers, moved by her hard case; calling God to witness her sincerity in the treaty. She repeated the whole proceeding, saying she was a chopping stone, and that she had prevented some enterprises, which, if she had listened to them, might have overthrown this estate.

There are few princes who would not long since have removed such a chopping stone, was Mr. Waad's comment, and then again he launched into eulogies on his mistress's goodness. "So reasoning," he adds, "I withdrew myself as though I had been drawn against my will into these discourses, being sent for another purpose, to be present at her conference with Mons. Maron."

During all this long talk between the Queen of Scots and Mr. Waad, which we have partly summarised, partly quoted, Shrewsbury had sat down in consequence of his gout, and did not hear a request of the Queen's that Maron might confer with her Secretary; but when it was repeated to him he objected, saying Maron was to have conference with none but the Queen. Hereupon followed a discussion, and in the end Shrewsbury suggested that Maron might in Nau's presence declare the cause, and help the Queen to understand it. "Here," says Waad, "we stuck long on the difficulty of the cause, and to show how easy it was to conceive, I took upon me to declare it to the Queen in English, perceiving that she was already acquainted therewith." Finally they accepted this offer, but would not enter into the cause then, for fear of wearying the Queen, though Shrewsbury would have had it done at one conference. It was then agreed to repair the next day to her presence.

As they were leaving the room, Nau spoke to Waad, asking him to let the Queen have some talk with him, to renew her offers to her Majesty. Waad replied that he was there to wait on Maron, but

when his matter was ended, he would report anything Mary commanded him.

The next day, after the Queen of Scots had ended with Maron and granted willingly all he demanded, she showed how she had been injured in her dowry. The county of Turraine had been taken from her, and no recompense given; the Earl Chasteauvillain had made himself one of the King's secretaries to defraud her of that right which was due of the fifth by purchase of the said county, and her cousin, the Duke of Dommali's sister, had a fleece from her, with whom she was in suit.

The business ended, they fell into general talk, and, out of an enquiry by Mary why they did not provide a wife for Monsieur (the Duke of Anjou), passed on to questions of religious toleration. Maron remarked that he saw here the churches and the crosses standing, and there wanted but the mass. Mary replied that the English were better than the French or the Scots, unless it were the Puritans, "for generally it was noted that all those of the religion did take somewhat of the obedience they owe to their prince."

After a reference to her excommunication by "a poor minister Knox," and a remark that she was old and diseased and could have no more children, nor live long, Mary then said she wished the treaty for the Queen's marriage with Monsieur [Anjou] had gone forward, though many thought she should not have wished it: "for I should have been kin to them both; at the least I did hope to have been bidden to the marriage of both my kinsfolks, else I should have thought unkindness."

Coming again to the treaty, the conversation turned on the King of Scots, and Mary said, "I know the child doth love me, and will not deal with the Queen without my advice. I offered to make him do what the Queen would, and will yet do it if I may have assurance. I have but one bairn, and half of him I will give to the Queen, by my troth, with all my heart. She must not use him roughly, but by gentle means win him; for if you ride him with a rough bit he will leap aside, as a young colt doth. I will undertake to bring him to that pass the Queen will have, if she will trust me. Let the Queen try me, and if ever I deceive her she may do with me what she pleases."

Mary and Nau both pressed Waad for his advice, but he excused himself as having no commission, and not knowing Scotland nor the names of three men of account in the realm. "In faith," quoth the Queen of Scots, "if you had said you had not known three honest men, I would have easily believed you, for I know there is scarce three honest men to be found in all the country."

Mary explained that she had already written to her kinsfolk in France to offer service to the Queen and to seek her favour. She feared war might ensue in Scotland; she spoke of her enemies about the Queen; the slanders against her; her fear that some one might obtain the custody of her to make away with her, which she often repeated, and said she knew some would sue for that charge. Huntingdon was her enemy. She and her son could pretend nothing, for they were strangers; she had besides the Queen,

but two kindreds in the realm, Hertford and Derby; she could not endure to have her right after her Majesty touched, not that she hoped on it, for though ten years younger than her Majesty, she seemed twenty years older; if she might come to her presence (which now she hoped not for) she would satisfy her what flatterers she had about her, not worthy to come near her, that tell her of her beauty and her divinity; and, Mary said, she would not flatter.

Thus the conversation went on, passing over the same ground many times, and finally the Queen of Scots told Waad she would give him a message for his mistress. It was as follows:—

"She desired her to consider how she had besought her favour, and proceeded in all soundness with the last treaty, as she referred to the consciences of Shrewsbury, Mildmay, and Beale; she foretold what would come to pass, but if the Queen would hear her, she would undertake to govern her son as the Queen would; her Majesty might consider how near he was to her; she would give her half of him with all her heart; she desired only her Majesty's favour, and would cause her son so to do; if the Queen would trust her, she would never deceive her; however often she sends by herself she will do no good; if I may send with her I will cause my son to do whatever she can require; she had had sixteen years' imprisonment, and her health has greatly decayed; she could not live more than five or six years, which she would be glad to lead with some content; she could not walk two arrowshots, by reason of a distillation that was fallen into her legs; she had endured her imprisonment with patience, and served, as Jacob did to Laban, not seven and seven years, but sixteen, which she had not done for nothing. She looked for some reward of her captivity, the winning of the Queen's favour; she had followed my Lord Treasurer's advice, to abide her imprisonment with

patience, and hearken to no practices; she therefore looked for some reward, the Queen's favour; when she despaired of recovering it, she would have no further respect, for worse could not happen than she had already endured; she looked to leave her carcase in prison, and therefore cared not what might happen, and would wash her hands of all. She would request leave to go to the Baths to recover her health, as it gave her great ease. She likewise desired it last year, but was put off by the treaty, until it was too late; this year she hoped to have that leave. She thanked her Majesty for the promise to punish the authors of the slanders against her; Toplif [Topcliff] was one, and Charles Candish [Cavendish] another; the Countess of Shrewsbury did not bear her that good will which the Queen supposed, 'who with her divers times laughed at such reports, and now did accuse her. It touched his lordship as well as her, wherefore she trusted as a nobleman he would regard his house.' She wished this to be signified to the Lord Treasurer, Leicester, and Walsingham, desiring their favour in this suit.

"When in the outer chamber, Nau desired the Earl's leave to speak to me. He wished me to think that he was as well affected to this realm as any stranger could be, and better than some, of whom there was better opinion. If he had used some words that I thought he might have kept in, he did it as a servant, and before the other, in whose presence he was to show some other countenance than he bore; his mistress and he had considered my words about causing her servants to take another course, and she would do it; I might assure her Majesty, though the late treaty had no effect, that his mistress was contented to enter again, if she might have assurance; her servants in France would be instructed to leave off all intelligence with English subjects; he would continue to do all good offices."[1]

In consequence of Waad's report of these conversations with the Queen of Scots, Elizabeth issued instructions to Robert Beale, dated the 4th May, directing him to repair to Sheffield, and there ascer-

[1] "A relation of Mr. Waad's conference with the Scotch Queen." *Pp.* 24. *Endorsed*, April 25, 1584.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. XIII, No. 20.

tain if the Queen of Scots remained in the same mind as when Waad saw her. If Mary held to the offers then put forward, Beale was to say that Elizabeth would proceed with the treaty.[1]

Beale arrived at Sheffield Castle on Wednesday night, May 13th, and communicated his instructions to Shrewsbury; but an interview with the Queen of Scots was deferred to the following afternoon, because of an indisposition that had confined Mary to her chamber for eight days past. When admitted to her presence, Shrewsbury and Beale delivered their letters of credence, and told her that Waad had informed Queen Elizabeth of her protestations of sincerity in the treaty begun last year, and of her two offers, of inducing her son to favour the English party in Scotland, and of forbidding her ministers in France to deal with rebels, without her Majesty's leave. The Queen, trusting therefore that she would perform both these her former offers, made while Mildmay was in Sheffield, had sent Beale down, and given both Beale and Shrewsbury charge to ask whether she still intended to perform her offers, and to inform her of her Majesty's further pleasure.

Hereupon followed one of those tedious and unsatisfactory conversations, in which recriminations were mingled with diplomatic efforts to avoid entangling pledges. For two days Shrewsbury and Beale maintained the argument without arriving at any conclusion.[2] The following day, Beale reported the conversation to Walsingham, and said,

[1] Elizabeth's instructions to Beale, May 4.—*MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. XIII., No. 24.

[2] Shrewsbury and Beale to Walsingham, May 16.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. XIII., No. 28.

in a private letter, which accompanied the official despatches:—

"You will perceive by our other letters what we have done. We cannot by all the cunning that we have, bring her to make any absolute promise for the performance of the offers made to Mildmay and Waad, unless she may be first assured of the Queen's favour, and of the accomplishment of the treaty; this done, she is minded to do as much as she has offered, or may be required of her with honour. The breaking off in like treaties heretofore, makes her more circumspect now how she entangles herself again. She seems marvellous glad of the late success in Scotland, and especially that her son had a heart to go into the field himself. However, from the reasons alleged to her for procuring some reconciliation in respect of her son's safety, I perceive she can be easily induced to deal for some of them, as Angus, Marr, Bothwell; but she retains another mind towards Gowry and Lindsay upon some ancient quarrel of Lochleven. In the points concerning her Majesty, the submitting of her right to Parliament, not troubling the State under colour of religion or otherwise, she seems to be minded as last year. I know not whence comes her desire to leave the realm, and to go to Scotland, for last year she seemed not to like it. Nau says the French Ambassador wrote that you spoke to him as though the Queen intended to have sent her thither, if she had not done certain things at which her highness took offence. I remit this to others, but think that if a good treaty might be concluded, her being there would be less dangerous than here. Advises that if Mildmay comes, he should have authority to conclude and not only treat, otherwise she says she will take it for a refusal and not deal at all, whatever shall become of her."[1]

Beale's report was not deemed satisfactory, and on the 23rd May, Elizabeth had resolved to forbear proceeding further with the treaty.[2] Not without reason did the Queen come to this conclusion; but

[1] Beale to Walsingham, May 17.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. XIII., No. 29.
[2] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. XIII., No. 32.

we shall understand the situation better, if we turn for a short time to the communications that were passing between the French and Spanish Ambassadors and their respective Courts.

On the 22nd March, in the midst of her fairest professions to Elizabeth, Mary wrote to Dr. William Allen, the head of the English Seminary at Rheims, and the soul of all the conspiracies woven against the Queen of England. To him she complained of the suspension of the annual allowance on which she depended to work out her deliverance, and urged that when the moment for action arrived it would be necessary to send a body of soldiers, either Englishmen or foreigners, to set her at liberty. She pointed out the ease with which such a *coup de main* could be effected, for the castle where she was detained was not fortified, and it was not necessary to take any account of the garrison.[1]

On the 18th April, De Tassis, writing from Paris to the King of Spain, was discussing the various considerations in favour of a landing in England or in Scotland; but it was necessary, he thought, to place before every consideration of this kind the double object of the enterprise, namely, the re-establishment of the Catholic religion in England and the deliverance of Mary Stuart. So far as mere strategical reasons were concerned, De Tassis deemed the Scotch landing preferable, but the "double object" turned the scale in favour of England. His conviction was that Mary Stuart herself ought to effect her own deliverance, and he advised Philip

[1] *Teulet's* Supplement to Labanoff, p. 325.

to grant her request for twelve thousand crowns, to enable her to put a scheme of escape into execution. He spoke of the urgent entreaties addressed by Mary Stuart to the King of Spain, to hasten him to action "in the public interests," without taking any account of her personal danger, and related the entire confidence she placed in the great prudence of the Catholic King.[1]

Lord Seaton, too, was actively negotiating at the French Court, in the name of James VI., to obtain armed assistance for the King and his mother; but the King of France was firmly resolved to keep the peace with his neighbours, and especially with the Queen of England.[2] Thus nothing could be made of France; and Philip moved far too slowly and too cautiously to please the eager conspirators in England. Nevertheless he contrived to sustain their hopes; but the Government of Elizabeth knowing what was being attempted, took the utmost care to fall under no illusions on the subject of Queen Mary's good intentions.

On the 10th June, Francis, Duke of Anjou and Alençon, Elizabeth's late suitor, died at Chateau Thierry, and on the same day Sir Francis Throckmorton was executed in London for the conspiracy he embarked in, along with Paget and Somerville, for the deliverance of the Queen of Scots, and the overthrow of Elizabeth. Writing on the 16th June, Walsingham informs the Earl of Shrewsbury that Queen Elizabeth takes the death of Anjou "very grievously, conceiving that she has lost a very good

[1] *Teulet*, v. 5, p. 325. [2] *Teulet*, v. 3, p. 277.

friend," and keeps herself private because of her grief. "I doubt not," he continues, "that when the French Ambassador has access to her Majesty, she will yield to the going forward of the treaty, from which I hope good effects will follow, unless some ill dealing of that Queen's is meanwhile discovered, or her son proceeds more violently in prosecuting the distressed noblemen."

In the same letter, permission is granted to Shrewsbury to take the Queen of Scots to Buxton when he thinks meet, and if the treaty goes forward the Ambassador will have access to the Scotch Queen during her stay there. "It is reduced already to such heads as the conclusion cannot hang long after it is once entered into, so your stay cannot now be long."

As to Shrewsbury's entreaty to be relieved of his charge, Walsingham is desired by Queen Elizabeth to say he cannot repair to Court presently, in consequence of Queen Mary going to Buxton; but she will take resolution therein sometime during the summer.[1]

In compliance with the requests of the Queen of Scots, and acting on the permission conveyed in Walsingham's letter, the Earl of Shrewsbury removed his charge to Buxton. The exact time of the journey is not recorded, but it must have been shortly after the receipt of Walsingham's letter, for on the 7th July, we find the Queen of Scots writing from Buxton to M. de Mauvissière, and saying:—

[1] Draft [Walsingham] to Shrewsbury, June 16.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. XIII., No. 34.

"Monsieur de Mauvissière, as soon as the cure of my arm permitted me to write to the Queen, my good sister, I was desirous not to fail to render the thanks which I owe to her for the favour which she has shown to me in this my journey; from which, if the end resembles the commencement, I hope to derive more relief for my health than from any other remedy which until now I have used. It is incredible how this cure has soothed[1] my nerves, and dried my body of the phlegmatic humours, with which by reason of feeble health, it was so abundantly filled.

"Now, in order to prevent my falling into the same state during the coming winter, continuing in this miserable captivity, and in order to finish at once my so long tedium which I regard as my greatest misfortune, I am now again making all the entreaty that I am able to the said Queen, my good sister, that it may please her to make an end of the treaty for my liberty, so long held in suspense; for which, in presenting to her my letters here enclosed, I pray you to urge her in the strongest manner that you are able, both in my name and on the part of the King [of France] my good brother, and let me know the answer which you obtain from her and from the Lords of her Council, representing to them that, inasmuch as until now it has not been my fault that matters have not gone on more pleasantly on the side of Scotland, and as I have not failed to offer all that I could do for the satisfaction of the said Queen, I therefore pray them not to impute to me anything which may there turn out for the worse, for want of my remedying it, as I unspeakably wish to do, both for the welfare, preservation, and safety of my son, and for the general tranquillity of this island, and not having, after so many conferences, letters and conversations on this subject, anything further to add, I will finish by commending myself very cordially to your good favour, praying God that he will have you, Monsieur de Mauvissière, in His holy and worthy keeping. Bouxtons, 7 July, 1584.

"Your very obliged and best friend,

"MARY."[2]

[1] Literally, "Taken the stiffness from." [2] *Labanoff*, v. 6, p. 2.

We have met with nothing to show the exact duration of this last visit of the Queen of Scots to Buxton. Her own letters, as printed by Labanoft, are interrupted for an interval of exactly two months, between the 7th July, when she wrote as above from Buxton, and the 7th September, when she again addressed Mauvissière from Wingfield.[1] A letter from Lord Shrewsbury to the Earl of Leicester, endorsed "the copy of my letter of the 8th August, 1584," and dated "Sheffield," shows that at that time Shrewsbury and his charge had returned to their old familiar quarters. Hence we may infer that a period of a month or six weeks would represent the duration of Mary's sojourn at the Baths.

Before quitting Buxton, the Queen of Scots took a sad farewell of the famous spring, writing with a diamond on the window-pane,

> "Buxtona, quæ calidæ celebraris nomine Lymphæ,
> Forte mihi post hac non adeunda, Vale,"

lines that may thus be rendered: Buxton, celebrated on account of thy tepid waters, perhaps never more to be visited by me, farewell.

The time was at length arriving when Shrewsbury was to be relieved from his long and trying service. The permission to visit London so often requested, and so tantalizingly delayed, was granted in August, when Queen Elizabeth informed Sir Ralph Sadler that she had chosen him to take charge of the Queen of Scots in place of Shrewsbury, who was licensed to make his repair to Court. Mr. Somer was appointed to assist in the service, and Elizabeth promised to

[1] *Labanoff*, v. 6, p. 7.

ease Sadler of that charge as soon as conveniently might be.[1]

Lord Darcy, of Aston, was informed of the charge given to Sadler, and the Sheriffs of Derby, Nottingham, and Leicester, as well as all Justices of the Peace and Mayors, were formally called upon to render such aid as he might require."[2]

Sadler set out on his journey on the 18th August, and arrived at Sheffield on Tuesday, the 25th; but even then there were "contraries" to perplex Queen Elizabeth's servants. Orders were issued from London, the day Sadler left home, directing Shrewsbury to remove the Queen of Scots to Wingfield, and see her settled there under the care of Sadler, before coming up to Court. "This," says Shrewsbury, "I will perform, though it will be very troublesome;" and he proposed to take his journey on the 27th August, or as soon after as possible.[3]

Sadler, however, knew nothing of these arrangements; his orders referring wholly to Sheffield, with no word of Wingfield. Therefore, on arriving at Sheffield, and hearing from Shrewsbury, for the first time, of the changed intention, he objected to travel again so soon. Sadler says:—

"I have asked Shrewsbury to stay his remove until we hear the Queen's commands. Not more than two or three days need be lost. Comparing the openness of the country about Wingfield, and the greatness of the house, and therefore the more danger, to the straightness of this and so the stronger, I would rather choose to keep this Queen here with sixty men,

[1] Draft.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. xiii., No. 41.

[2] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. xiii., Nos. 42, 43, and 44.

[3] Shrewsbury to Burghley, Aug. 25.—*MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. xiii., No. 48.

than there with 300; of which mind his Lordship is also. There will also be slow coming of convenient victual from remoter parts upon so short warning."[1]

This letter was dated from "Sheffield Lodge," and in a postscript Sadler added: "Being but newly arrived, I have not yet seen the Scotch Queen."

Shrewsbury was rather annoyed than pleased at Sadler's punctiliousness, for he had already sent away his "stuff" to Wingfield, and though he agreed to stay till they could hear again from Court, he says, "For my part I like not these contrarieties."[2]

While Shrewsbury and Sadler were awaiting the the return of their messengers, let us glance at the family relations among the Talbots, whose quarrels were now at such a height as to have seriously influenced Elizabeth in her determination to take the Queen of Scots out of the hands of the Earl of Shrewsbury.

When Beale was at Sheffield in May, he endeavoured to compose the differences between the Earl and his son Gilbert, and said, in a letter to Walsingham:—

"I have dealt with the Earl touching his son, and find him well affected towards him, save that he says he is ruled by his wife, who is directed by her mother. I think his hatred for her will hardly be appeased, as he thinks the slanders and other information made to her Majesty have proceeded from her. He says he requires only obedience as to a father, and will not be taught by any to rule his child. Touching the Lady Arbell [Arabella Stuart], he hath received a letter from H., how after my departure, upon his being with her Majesty, she had re-

[1] Sadler to Walsingham, Aug. 25.—*MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. xiii., No. 49.
[2] Postscript.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. xiii., No. 48.

ferred the matter wholly unto him, and was sorry for the letter that she had willed you to write; and therefore he hath given order to deliver her to her grandmother, the rather for that he saith she had sent up to the contrary, and had given out in this country that her credit in Court was better than his, and so would stay her there. I have advised my Lord Talbot to yield until his father may be better persuaded. Sheffield, 17 May."[1]

On the 8th August, Shrewsbury wrote to the Earl of Leicester, evidently in reply to the suggestions or remonstrances of that courtier; but also with an allusion to the then recent death of Leicester's only son Robert, Baron of Denbigh, who died in infancy, July 19th, 1584, and whom, according to the Queen of Scots, the Countess of Shrewsbury designed to marry to her granddaughter Arabella. Shrewsbury says:—

"For that I perceive your Lordship takes God's handy work thankfully, and for the best, doubt not but God will increase you with many good children, which I wish with all my heart. And when it pleases you to put me in mind of Gilbert Talbot, as though I should remember his case by my own, truly, my Lord, they greatly vary. For my son, I never dissuaded him from loving his wife, though he hath said he must either forsake me, or hate his wife; this he gives out, which is false and untrue. This I think is his duty: that, seeing I have forbid him from coming to my wicked and malicious wife, who hath set me at naught in his own hearing, that contrary to my commandment, hath both gone and sent unto her daily by his wife's persuasion, yea and hath both written and carried letters to no mean personages in my wife's behalf. These ill dealings would he have salved by indirect reports, for in my life did I never seek their separation; for the best ways I have to content myself is to think it is his wife's wicked persuasion, and her mother's together, for I think neither barrel better herring of

[1] *Holograph, pp.* 3. *Add. End.* 17 May, 1584, &c. Beale to Walsingham. —*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. XIII., No. 29.

them both. This my misliking to them both argues not that I would have my son make so hard a construction of me, that I would have him hate his wife, though I do detest her mother. But, to be plain, he shall either leave his indirect dealings with my wife, seeing I take her as my professed enemy, or else indeed will I do that to him I would be loth, seeing I have heretofore loved him so well; for he is the principal means and countenance she hath, as he uses the matter, which is unfit; yet will I not be so unnatural in deeds as he reports in words, which is that I should put from him the principal things belonging to the earldom. He hath been a costly child to me, which I think well bestowed if he come here again in time. He takes the way to spoil himself with having his wife at London; therefore, if you love him, persuade him to come down with his wife, and settle himself in the country; for, otherwise, during his abode with his wife at London, I will take the £200 I give him yearly, besides alienating my good will from him."[1]

Writing to Burghley, on the 25th August, the Earl of Shrewsbury says:—

"If William Cavendish denies anything that I have alleged against him, I will confute him by substantial witness. That being done, I trust his imprisonment in the Fleet will not be considered sufficient punishment. Now, my good lord, where your lordship hath been very oft solicited to write on the behalf of my son, Gilbert Talbot, and of my wife, which hitherto your lordship hath forborne until you might know what their causes were, I do heartily thank your lordship for your honourable consideration taken on that respect, and do very heartily pray your lordship not to yield unto any requests hereafter by them to be made on that behalf. For as to my wife, she hath sought to impoverish me and to enrich herself. She hath sought the ruin and decay of my house and posterity, and to raise up her house and name into that honour. She hath sought my discredit and slander, in the face of the world; and albeit she hath a little changed the air, yet she doth carry the old mind, which hath nothing now left to work upon but mine

[1] Shrewsbury to Leicester, Aug. 8.—*Lodge*, v. 2, p. 293.

old carcase, whereof I do think she would make a sacrifice, if I should receive her again.

"And as to my son, Gilbert Talbot, albeit I have loved him above all my children, and albeit he doth know the practices which his mother-in-law hath used, yet he doth combine himself to her, and doth give countenance to them that are her principal instruments. This notwithstanding I would be good father unto him, if he would be good son unto me, whereof, by his outward actions, I can find no hope; and therefore, my good lord, I do take it a far better course and more for my security, to estrange myself from intermeddling with him, until such time, by due repentance and obedience, he hath washed away such faults as he hath committed; whereof I do not esteem it among the least to hear the bruits which by him have been published, that I have taken the chiefest things of the earldom from him, which is merely untrue. Sheffield, 25 Aug., 1584."[1]

Sadler had an interview with the Queen of Scots the day after his arrival at Sheffield. Mary expressed her thanks to Queen Elizabeth for sending him down, adding, "now Shrewsbury is going to her Majesty, he can inform her of her doings while under his charge, and she required none other favour but that he would say the worst he knew of her."

On the 31st August, Sadler, Shrewsbury, and Somer went again to the Queen's room, "upon her own motion," and after some explanations, she told them "how desirous she was to do anything that might like her Majesty, and was very sorry her Majesty had not answered the offers she had made long ago, wherein her conscience bears her witness that she means uprightly towards the Queen and the realm; she would make this appear, if her Majesty would make proof of her."

[1] Shrewsbury to Burghley, Aug. 25.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. XIII., No. 48.

On the day this interview took place, Sadler received a reply to his letters of the 25th August, touching the Queen's staying at Sheffield or going to Wingfield. The decision was left to Shrewsbury and Sadler, and they resolved on the removal. It was thought that in a new residence there would be fewer chances of communication; and besides this, Shrewsbury had already made some preparations at Wingfield, both for the Queen's diet, lodging, and safety; and, though Sadler does not mention this point, there is no doubt it had its influence in deciding Shrewsbury in favour of a change. It was arranged, therefore, to remove on Wednesday, the 2nd September, and when the Queen was settled in her new abode, Shrewsbury proposed to set out on Monday, the 7th, travelling to Court by way of Leicester, Northampton, and Dunstable.

Sadler complains that he had found the posts by the way somewhat slack. "I think," he says, "they measure their paces by the diversities of the endorsements of the packets. Your patent letter, by your next commodity to be seen to them all, will perhaps quicken them a little." Sadler further reminded the Secretary, that posts would be necessary at Wingfield, and at Nottingham, a distance of twelve miles, to serve to Grantham. Shrewsbury appointed one of his own men, at his own cost, at Sheffield, to take the letters to Doncaster, where they would join the regular system of communication on the great North road.

The letter from which we gather the above particulars is dated, "From my Lordship's house,

in Sheffield Park, 2 September, 1584."[1] Thus we see it was from the Manor that the Queen took her final departure from Sheffield. She had been in that town, living either at the Castle or the Manor, with but occasional brief intervals, since the 28th November, 1570, so that only twelve weeks and two days were wanting to complete a residence of fourteen years in Hallamshire. As the Queen of Scots came to Sheffield without pleasure, she left it without regret. It was but with the eyes of a captive that she looked on the bold and striking landscape, and marked the windings of the broadening valley of the Don. From the summit of the Manor, Mary might trace among the hills, the valleys of the Loxley, the Rivelin, the Sheaf, and the Porter. Occasionally excursions for exercise, or for hawking, may have been permitted in the chases of Fulwood and Rivelin; but usually the ample limits of Sheffield Park marked the boundaries of her out-door amusements, and from the hunting tower or stand, which at that time occupied the site of the Stand-house Farm, the Queen of Scots perhaps not unfrequently watched the progress of the chase.

Now, however, she was to leave Sheffield, and as it proved, for ever.

[1] Sadler to Walsingham, Sept. 2.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. xiii., No. 53.

CHAPTER XXII.

THE Lords and gentlemen about the Queen of Scots seem to have treated as a mere matter of course the preparations for and details of the removal. We know not whether it was done with much ceremony, or with little, but judging from the silence of the letters, and knowing the jealousy with which anything like ostentation was regarded at Court, we may safely conclude that the journey was not allowed to attract much public attention. The route lay southward, over the undulating country that divides Sheffield from Wingfield, and an easy day's march would bring the royal captive to her destination.

On the way, Mary talked with Mr. Somer, Sir Ralph Sadler's son-in-law, protesting in amplest terms her desire to conform in anything to the will of Queen Elizabeth, and Somer made the following memorandum of their conversation :—

"*Talk between the Scottish Queen and me* (Mr. SOMER), *riding from Sheffield to Wingfield. 2 September*, 1584.

"After she had again uttered her grief of her long imprisonment, having spent her years from twenty-four to past forty, and by cumber and impotency become old in body, she delivered the like grief as she had done three days past to my lord of Shrewsbury, and Mr. Chancellor of the Duchy, that the Queen's Majesty had no confidence in her words, when she told the truth to Sir William Mildmay and Mr. Beale, as things

have happened since in Scotland; whereof, and of Mr. Secretary's evil usage and reception in Scotland, going thither without her recommendation, she said she foretold, but could not be believed. And now that her Majesty having found her true in that, if her highness would trust her, it should appear yet that she hath means and credit to do her good service.

"I told her (as I had done the other day) that upon further proof, and leaving to practise, and to have unfit intelligence with her son, and some evil ministers about him to the trouble of her Majesty, and of her estates, she might find her highness her good friend. And that their writings which are come to her Majesty's knowledge, wherein is spoken of an enterprise in England, tending for her liberty and increasing of her son's greatness, and so meant to come to her, hath both greatly offended her Majesty, and given her cause to think that she, the Scottish Queen, is a party in that enterprise, whatsoever it is.

"As for to have intelligence (quoth she) with my son, and to esteem of them whom he maketh account of, as his good servants, and doth so recommend them unto me, I must needs do that; for if I should leave my son, who is to me more than any thing in this world, and trust the Queen my good sister's favour, which I cannot get, I might be so without both, and then what should become of me? and as for my son, nothing can sever me from him; for I live for him, and not for myself. And therefore surely, said she, I must trust to the one. But, quoth she, if I might be assured and find to have the Queen my good sister's favour, and that she would trust me in the points which I have long offered, and now lately moved, and in other good offices that I would do, she should find good cause to think better of me than she hath done; for, quoth she, I have my son's own hand yet to show, that he offers to be ordered altogether by me in all things, who also hath sent me certain things to have mine opinion upon them: whereof he hath long called for answer; but I have of purpose stayed it yet, and done nothing thereunto, hoping that the Queen my good sister would have employed me in the good motions I have made. Therefore, quoth she, if it would please her Majesty to be served by me, it is time; for in good faith, Mr. Somer, I fear my son will take another course

shortly without my direction. Wherein I shall not be able then to stay him, as I am sure I can do yet. And as to the enterprise you spoke of, by my troth I knew not nor heard anything of it; nor, so God have my soul, will ever consent anything that should trouble this state, whereof I seek the quiet with all my heart; for if any unquietness should happen here, it would be laid to my charge, and so might I be in greater danger.

"And as to another point (which indeed I had told her then of an instruction *given to ung quidam*), to be sent to the Duke of Guise, that he should hasten things, because the Queen's Majesty, as was there written, was about to cause the King of Scots to die by an extraordinary death (which was too great an indignity and irreparable wrong done to the Queen's Majesty my sovereign, as most false, and far from her Majesty's thought), she said, that indeed my Lord Ruthven had told the King her son so, as she heard; but, so God have her soul, she suspended her judgment therein.

"Well, madam, quoth I, you hear what evil ministers do, thinking to do you and your son good service; but it is far otherwise, and therefore deserve small credit by hindering you, and thus to trouble the Queen's Majesty. But seeing, quoth I, you disavow the knowledge of these things, and do offer to do so good offices for her highness' service, and to have her favour, may I be so bold to ask your Grace, what you have thought upon the matter in particular, and what you would do to have her Majesty's favour.

"Marry, quoth she, to persuade my son to enter into a good mutual league, offensive and defensive, with the Queen my good sister, if she would so like of it, and therein to comprehend the King of France in respect of the ancient league between France and Scotland; and as I know, quoth she, the French King hath commanded his Ambassador, M. de Mauvissière, to have special care of that, if any treaty should be talked of between England and Scotland. And such a league, quoth she, would be better for England than for Scotland, because England lieth more upon those that have been dangerous to it than Scotland doth, and so shall those two realms live long in peace, seeing no foreign prince doth claim anything in them.

"This seemeth a very good motion, quoth I, and a thing which the princes of both realms have always sought by alliances and other ways. But hath been oft impeached by foreign practices and ambition of some of that realm; as namely of fresh memory, the motion of a match between King Edward VI. and her.

"Therefore, quoth she, it is good to look to it now, whilst it may be holpen, assuring that her son will hearken shortly abroad for a party, as he did already.

"Madam, quoth I, what other thing have you thought upon in this matter, for you have good leisure?

"In good faith, quoth she, Scotland is poor, not able to maintain a King, and therefore England must give good pensions, for so surely my son is so offered in other places. And thereby the Queen, my good sister, shall gain much; for by this means she should save greatly in her charge in Ireland, where, if she needed, my son would help with his folk to get her good obedience, and should not need (these two realms being so united in amity) to spend her money to maintain the wars in other countries to keep her own in quiet, naming what her Majesty had done in France, and in the King of Spain's countries, who remember, and have their eyes fixed upon her doings.

"Besides that, quoth she, all my kinsfolks would be her faithful friends, whom she doth now suspect; and then commended highly the Duke of Guise for his valiantness and faithfulness to his friends. There is another thing to be done, quoth she, in this case, which must be my care; that is, the Pope's bull against all those of the religion protestant, which I will take in hand to deal in. That in respect of me being a Catholic Queen, the same shall not touch my realm, though my son be a Protestant; and then none will dare touch the one realm for religion without offending both. Thus Mr. Somer, quoth she, I speak plainly to you, that you may testify of my good will to do good, if it please the Queen to trust me. And I would to God the Queen, my good sister, knew my heart, which in good faith she shall never find false to her, so as I and my son may have the Queen's Majesty's favour, as appertains, being of her blood, and so near.

"Madam, quoth I, if you mean thereby any claim after her Majesty, as you have been plain with me, so I beseech you give me leave to be plain with you: that is, if you or your son speak anything in the world of that matter, either in any such treaty as you desire, or by other discourse or message that you may make or send to her Majesty, I know that you shall greatly displease her highness and her people, and do yourself no good; therefore, whatsoever you or your son do think thereof, leave off to deal therein, and leaving all to God's goodwill, be content with her Majesty's favour otherwise, if you hope to have it of her highness, for she knoweth by dire experience what it is to offend her Majesty in great things. She thanked me for my plainness and good advice, and said she would not offend her Majesty therein; desiring then that she might have at the least her highness like favour and estimation as other of her blood had at her hands.

"Then did I ask her opinion where as she thought, the King her son had fancy to match, and that I had heard of the Princess of Lorraine. She said there was such a motion, but thought it would not be. And said that the Duke of Florence had offered his daughter, being of 14 or 15 years, and a million of crowns with her. Why, madam, quoth I, do you think that the Duke would send his daughter from that warm and dainty country of Tuscany into that cold realm of Scotland; yea, I warrant you, quoth she. She said also, that there was a motion made for a daughter of Denmark, with great commodity of money and friendship; but that crown going by election, he was not sure of longer friendship than the old King's life, and therefore had no great fancy that way. Then did I ask her of any offer of Spain; she said merrily so as her son may have the Low countries withal it were not amiss; but who can warrant that. But truely, said she, I knew of none there. But I am sure, quoth she, my son will marry as I well advise him.

"Here, falling into other talk, she asked me whether I thought she would escape from hence or no, if she might. I answered plainly, I believed she would; for it is natural for everything to seek liberty, that is kept in strict subjection. No, by my troth, quoth she, you are deceived in me; for my heart is so great, that I had rather die in this sort with honour than run

away with shame. I said I would be sorry to see the trial. Then she asked me if she were at liberty with the Queen's Majesty's favour, whither I thought she would go. I think, quoth I, madam, you would go to your own in Scotland, as it is good reason and command there. It is true, quoth she, I would go thither indeed, but only to see my son, and to give him good counsel. But unless her Majesty would give her countenance and some maintenance in England, would go into France, and live there among her friends with that little portion she hath there, and never trouble herself with government again, nor dispose myself to marry any more, seeing that she had a son that is a man; but said she would never stay long there, nor would govern where she hath received so many evil treatments: for her heart could not abide to look upon those folk that had done her that evil, being her subjects: whereof they are yet many remaining; for I had told her that they were almost all dead. Ever in her talk beseeching her Majesty to make a trial of her, that with some honourable end she may live the rest of her days out of this captivity, as she termeth it.

"This have I thought meet in duty to let be known to the Queen's Majesty, because here are some very material points."[1]

In a letter, dated 4th September, Sadler reported to Walsingham the successful removal of the Queen of Scots to Wingfield,

"Where she is well and safely placed, and all other things well, as far as I can see, with the same order of watch and ward that was at Sheffield, and this day his Lordship took their oaths [that is the oaths of the servants and soldiers]. It is surely a good band of handsome soldiers well appointed, and all show good wills to serve her Majesty, to obey my Lordship's commandment in their charges, and so do I surely believe them. Besides those forty, he leaveth here above four score of his household people, among whom, as officers and

[1] The original of this discourse is preserved in the Record Office.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. XIII., No. 55 and 51 I. It has been printed among the *Sadler* State Papers, v. III., pp. 147-152; and I have followed that text, modernising the spelling. Somer is curiously confused in his use of the first and the third person.

good guides, are divers gentlemen of good sort, and of very honest behaviour. . . My Lord holdeth his day to come towards you, and trusteth to be at the Court upon Friday, the 11th."[1]

Thus we see Shrewsbury adhered to his purpose of leaving Wingfield for London, on Monday, the 7th September; and then for the last time he took leave of the Queen of Scots as her guardian. The Earl had spent fifteen of the best years of his life in this irksome and thankless office, and now found himself, because of it, the victim of suspicion, and the martyr to a family feud of extraordinary virulence. When next he met Mary Stuart, it was at Fotheringhay, in October, 1586; Shrewsbury, as one of the Commissioners to try the Queen of Scots; and Mary, as a culprit to be judged.

On Sunday, the 6th September, Shrewsbury took a formal farewell of his jealously guarded captive, and declined to carry her letters to Queen Elizabeth; but Sadler, more compassionate, sent them with his own despatches. Mary's writing was at that time not so legible as usual, "by reason of a sore middle finger on her right hand, which she had strained, and there showed it,"[2] as Sadler remarked.

We have no detailed account of Shrewsbury's journey towards London, but he purposed sleeping three nights on the way. Almost exactly two years before the present date, namely, in August, 1582, when leave was given for his repair to Court, and afterwards withdrawn, Shrewsbury gave minute instructions to Baldwin, his agent, to make the needful preparations; and what was arranged then, would

[1] Sadler to Walsingham, Wingfield, Sept. 4.—*Sadler Papers*, v. 3, p. 154.
[2] Sadler to Walsingham, Sept. 7.—*Sadler Papers*, v. 3, p. 128.

be similarly arranged now. Shrewsbury directed the engagement of lodgings near the Court, for himself and his company, consisting of twenty gentlemen and twenty yeomen, with their men and horse keepers.[1] With some such retinue as this he left Wingfield; and if the journey was slow, it was also stately, and costly.[2]

On reaching the Court, which he would probably do on the 11th or 12th September, Shrewsbury was "very graciously used by her Majesty," who was "very desirous to compound the controversies between him and the lady, his wife," a matter which, adds Walsingham, "will not be performed over easily." Shrewsbury, too, was making suit to be fully discharged from the custody of the Scotch Queen; and he was also anxious to have his good name officially cleared from all aspersion.[3] To this end he readily obeyed a summons to attend a meeting of the Council, on the Tuesday after his arrival at Court, when he obtained "a memorable testimonial by Queen Elizabeth and the Lords of the Council, as to the discharge of his duty faithfully,

[1] *Lodge*, v. 2, p. 284.

[2] Sadler, writing on the 7th Sept., says:—"This morning my Lord departed hence to lodge this night at Leicester." Among the Shrewsbury Papers, in Lambeth Library, are some accounts showing the cost of journeys between Sheffield and London, made by Earl Gilbert, in 1602 and 1604. One of these, endorsed "October, 1602, journey from Sheffield to London," shows a total cost of £164. 17s. 7d. Another paper, dated 1604, gives the cost of a journey as £117. 17s. 7d.—*Shrewsbury Papers*, *Lambeth*, v. 1. Cod. Tenison, No. 694, fol. 19; and v. IX. Cod. Tenison, No. 702, fol. 47.

[3] Walsingham to Sadler, from Stelands, Sep. 16. In this letter Walsingham says:—"I hope within eight or ten days to give you some comfort, touching the release of the charge now committed unto you; for my Lord of Shrewsbury, doubting to be surprised by his ancient enemy the gout, will employ both his credit and his friends to procure his speedy despatch hence. The greatest impediment will be the suit he maketh to be discharged of the custody of the Lady remaining now in your hands, which difficulty I hope will be removed."—*Sadler Papers*, v. 3, p. 158.

and trust in the custody of the Queen of Scots." A minute or memorandum of the proceedings of the Council was entered in the record book, and Shrewsbury was careful to obtain a true and certified copy, which he ever after preserved among his family papers. This copy is still to be seen among the Talbot Papers, in the College of Arms, volume G., fol. 261; but it is carefully printed in Lodge's "Illustrations," v. 2, p. 296. The Lords present at the meeting of the Council were Lord Treasurer Burghley, the Earl of Leicester, Sir Henry Sidney, lord president of Wales; Sir Christopher Hatton, vice-chamberlain; Sir Francis Walsingham, secretary; and, of course, the Earl of Shrewsbury. The following is the minute, duly certified as "a true copy" from the original, in the Council chest:—

"This day the Earl of Shrewsbury, Earl Marshal of England, and one of the Lords of her Majesty's most honourable Privy Council, being lately come unto the Court, was warned to come to the Council appointed to be holden this day, which he did, and (in the beginning of their Lordships' sitting) standing up, used some speeches unto their said Lordships, to the effect following, viz.: That, seeing he had been now a great while absent from that honourable place, and had understood that in the mean whilest sundry untrue reports and bruits had been raised of him, as though he had not faithfully and loyally served her Majesty in the charge committed unto him, as he ought to have done; forasmuch as he knew the uprightness of his own conscience and actions, and that being especially named by her Majesty to take the charge he had (whereof he understood not the importance when he first received it, as since he hath proved it), and being persuaded at that time to accept thereof by such as thought to have led him at their pleasure to serve their turns, yet, after finding that they could not so much prevail with him, did find fault with his insuffi-

ciency; yet, nevertheless, he thanked God that he had performed as much as he then undertook and promised unto her Majesty, which was, to have the said charge always forthcoming, as she was at this present: sith his repair hither he had most humbly besought her Majesty that if he could be charged with any manner of disloyalty, or undutifulness in this charge, he might understand the same, and be admitted to his purgation, for her Highness' better satisfaction, and maintenance of his credit and honour, which he esteemed more than his life, lands, goods, or any earthly thing. Whereupon it pleased her Majesty, to his great comfort, most graciously to declare unto him that she knew no cause otherwise to conceive of him than of a true and loyal nobleman, and so reputed him, and thought that he had faithfully served her in the custody of the said charge; so, likewise, before he would be set down, and take his place as a councillor at this board (seeing the room [office] required a person which was not to be touched with any disloyalty or dishonour) he most humbly besought their Lordships (and especially her Majesty's Secretary, to whom such information most commonly first comes, and are imparted unto her Majesty, by reason of his office,) to signify unto him whether they, or any of them, either knew or have understood, anything that might touch him in honour or loyalty; and to declare the same unto him before he should proceed further, to the intent he might answer thereto, and clear himself, as appertained unto the honour and reputation of that place. After some speech uttered by the Lord Treasurer, that their Lordships all were right glad of his company, and, to his understanding, knew nothing otherwise of him than of a true and loyal nobleman; yet for that he did so instantly require to have their answer to that which he had propounded, his Lordship was desired to withdraw himself from the table to a cupboard, which he did. And so, upon some consultation among the rest of their Lordships then sitting, his Lordship being again called to his place, it was by the Lord Treasurer, in the behalf of all the rest, with their consents, declared unto him, that, albeit the presence then was small, and many of the Lords of her Majesty's Council absent, yet his Lordship, in the

name of them which were present, answered that they all concurred in one opinion: that they knew not, nor had heard of anything concerning his Lordship that tended to any disloyalty or undutifulness, but took and his Lordship for a very loyal and dutiful councillor and subject, and that he had faithfully and honourably discharged the service committed unto him. And likewise on behalf of her Majesty's Secretary, it was especially answered, that if he had understood any such thing, it had been his part to have signified the same unto her Majesty; protesting that as he never received any such information concerning his Lordship that might touch him in honour or loyalty, so did he not impart any such thing unto her Highness, as appeared by her Majesty's own justification of the said Earl. And if in some trifles, and private matters of small moment, not appertaining to the Queen's Majesty, his Lordship thought that his honour and reputation had been touched by the evil reports of any, he was required to think that the same was common to them, and others, as well as to himself, in the world; howbeit, if any person could be particularly charged by his Lordship, it was reason that he should be called to answer the same; and, therefore, his Lordship was desired to assure himself of this their Lordship's good and honourable opinion concerning his Lordship, and so to sit down as a person that was very meet for the company, there to serve her Majesty and the realm; and so, therewith, he took his place in council, according to his degree and office."

Practically this transaction before the Council closed the Earl of Shrewsbury's charge of the Queen of Scots; but it was not till the 3rd December, that Queen Elizabeth formally communicated to Queen Mary the fact that her keepers had been changed, and it was not till the beginning of 1585 that Mary's removal from Wingfield took place. The interval between September and December was occupied with intrigues, both in the little Court at Wingfield and the greater Court of England's Queen. Mary

was very anxious to know what was to be done with her, whether she was to be removed from the custody of the Earl of Shrewsbury, and whether it was possible to bring to any conclusion the long delayed negotiations for the treaty. She wished to obtain permission for her Secretary Nau to go to London to treat on her behalf; and Gilbert Curll, her Scotch Secretary, made himself busy in sending ciphers to Thomas Baldwin, Shrewsbury's agent, for the purpose of ascertaining the intentions of Elizabeth.[1]

These letters fell into Walsingham's hands, and Baldwin was thrown into prison. Elizabeth, fearing further practices, directed Sadler to have a watchful eye over his charge; "and," said Walsingham, "if your own servants that attend on you there be not furnished with dagges and petronells, you should in secret see to procure some furniture to be sent unto you from some of the well affected gentlemen in that country."[2]

Sadler reported, on the 8th of October, the apparent indifference of the Queen of Scots about the change of her keeper, "so she may be well used, and her person in safety;" and he thought there was little likelihood of her escape, seeing "the tenderness of her body, subject to a vehement rheum upon any cold, which causeth a plentiful distillation from above down unto her left foot, wherewith (resting there) she is much pained, and is sometime a little swollen." Then, too, the strength of the

[1] Curll's cipher to Baldwin, Sep. 20.—*Sadler Papers*, v. 3, p. 160.

[2] Walsingham to Sadler, Oct. 6.—*Sadler Papers*, v. 3, p. 169.

house was considerable. There were two wards, or guarded entrances, "the gentleman porter ever at the one with four or five of his company, and divers soldiers at the other." In the night there was a watch of eight soldiers, of whom four at least were always under the outward windows of her lodgings, and the rest walked about, armed with shot and halberds, "besides two who watch and ward day and night within the door going to her lodgings." There was also a watch kept in the villages round about.

Sadler also enumerated some of the gentlemen "of strength and trust" dwelling in the neighbourhood. Sir John Zouche, sometime at Codnor, now at Alfreton, two miles away; Sir Thomas Cockayne, eight or nine miles to the south; Mr. John Manners, towards Buxton, eight miles to the north-west; Mr. Curzon, the High Sheriff, ten miles on the south side; Sir Godfrey Foljambe, seven miles, beside Chesterfield on the north; Mr. Bassett, beside Derby; and Lord Darcy, at Aston, beside Sheffield, eighteen miles away, gave "dutiful offer of his ready service."

Further than this, Sadler had forty-three men, every one with sword and dagger, and some with pistols and long shot; and in the chambers where they lodge, "for every man his halbard or partwysants." Here, too, are "good horses and geldings standing in the stables within the base court of this Castle, all to be ready upon a very short warning." [1]

One of the occupations of Sadler and Somer,

[1] Sadler to Walsingham, Wingfield, Oct. 8.—*Sadler Papers*, v, 3, p. 170.

during the early part of their sojourn at Wingfield, was to search out the treacheries, real and supposed, of Shrewsbury's servants. We have already seen how Thomas Baldwin fell under suspicion through his ciphered communications with Gilbert Curll; and it was also the misfortune of Mr. Bentall, the gentleman porter, to arouse the jealousy of Queen Elizabeth. He was an old servant, and one whom Shrewsbury relied upon as "a gentleman of good wisdom and good trust by long experience."[1] Queen Elizabeth, however, had conceived "a very hard opinion of that man," and insisted upon somebody else being placed in his office.[2] An intimation to this effect reached both Shrewsbury and Walsingham on the 6th September, and, though his Lordship assured Sadler that he would have trusted Bentall with his life and honour; still, to avoid offence, he took him up in his train to Court, and appointed in his room one Mr. Wombwell, "a gentleman towards his Lordship, and of good livelihood in this shire, who in former times hath supplied that place in the absence of Mr. Bentall."[3]

Fortunately for Mr. Wombwell, the gout kept him from accepting so painful and thankless an office, and Mr. Salter became Bentall's successor, not without danger of suffering from the evil tongues of those who had poisoned the mind of Elizabeth against his predecessor. Sadler, in a letter dated Wingfield, 8th October, addressed to Walsingham, says:—

[1] *Sadler Papers*, v. 3, p. 123.
[2] Walsingham to Sadler, Sep. 4.—*Sadler Papers*, v. 3, p. 155,
[3] Sadler to Walsingham, Sep. 7.—*Sadler Papers*, v. 3, p. 127.

"As for Mr. Salter, now gentleman porter of this place, I have only known him since his entrance into that charge, which my Lord did mean to Mr. Wombwell, as I wrote to you; but the gout kept him happily from it, being so painful and thankless an office. And surely as for Salter, I see no cause to misdoubt him; he observeth his charge in show very carefully; he is ever at the gate. If any other than ordinary repair thither, he suffereth none such to come in or to depart without my knowledge, and hath the report of my Lord's oldest servants to be a very honest gentleman, and good servant to his Lordship. And namely so reported by Mr. Stringer, his Lordship's steward, whom I find so careful and serviceable, as he deserveth to be right well thought of. It is to be suspected that the same person who informed against Mr. Bentall, late gentleman porter, may perhaps cast somewhat also in this man's way. If my Lord have not told you of it, I can inform you of the truth at my return; and yet I will observe his doings according to her Majesty's commandment."[1]

The originator of the reports against Bentall appears to have been one Hawkesworth, formerly yeoman porter at Sheffield Castle, who had contrived to render himself acceptable, and his colleague distrusted, at Court. In a letter, dated 6th October, Walsingham writes to Sadler: "There is also one Hawkesworth, a gentleman well affected, that dwelleth within two miles of Sheffield, one much misliked of the Queen of Scots, and that is thought can discover many particularities of the state of things thereabouts."

Mr. Somer was therefore directed "to grow into some acquaintance with him upon some apt occasion,

[1] Sadler to Walsingham, Wingfield Oct. 8,—*Sadler Papers*, v, 3, p, 170. The Mr. Stringer mentioned above was the son of John Stringer of Overthorpe, died 30th Elizabeth (1588). He founded the family of Stringers of Sharlstone, near Wakefield, whose estate passed to the Beaumonts of Whitley-Beaumont.

and use the best means he can to draw from him that which were worthy the knowledge."[1]

William Hawkesworth was accordingly sent for, and came to Wingfield, from six miles beyond Sheffield, on the 13th October. It appeared, however, that he knew nothing of his own knowledge of the doings of the Queen of Scots, nor of any others in her favour. He had been six years in the service of Lord Shrewsbury as a soldier, and "then as long in the charge of yeoman porter in company of Mr. Bentall, gentleman porter." There was some unkindness between Mr. Bentall and himself, because he was "not so fully instructed of my Lord's pleasure as Mr. Bentall was." This led to jealousy and tale-bearing; but when Shrewsbury looked into the matter, he found no ground for Hawkesworth's suspicions. The yeoman porter then begged to be released from his situation, "seeing Mr. Bentall and he could not agree," and went to live with his father, "an old man, till Michaelmas following; and then was entertained in service with Sir Godfrey Foljambe, where he continued not a month, by reason of his father's sickness, about whom he continued till he died; and ever since hath dwelt with his mother, an old woman above four score years old, being made co-executors to his father."

Sadler pressed Hawkesworth to go to Court to clear these matters, but he made excuses about the state of his private affairs,[2] and thus avoided bringing his tales to the test of an interview with Shrewsbury

[1] *Sadler Papers*, v. 3, p. 168.

[2] Sadler to Walsingham, Oct. 14.—*Sadler Papers*, v. 3, p. 175.

and Bentall. The tittle-tattle of this discharged servant was gravely listened to at Court, so eager was Queen Elizabeth for information about the schemes of her rival, and the actions of those about her.

Thomas Baldwin, before his apprehension, which we have seen mentioned in Walsingham's letter of the 6th October, appeared along with one Cople at the General Sessions in Westminister Hall, to prosecute "one Walmesley, of Islington, an Inn holder, for scandilation of my Lord their master." William Fleetwood, Recorder of London, of whom Anthony Wood says, he was "a learned man, and a good antiquary, but of a marvellous merry and pleasant conceit," writes thus of the matter to Lord Burghley :—

"Thursday, the next day after [*i.e.*, 1st Oct., 1584], we kept the General Sessions at Westminster Hall for Middlesex. Surely it was very great. We sat the whole day and the next after also, at Finsbury. At this Sessions, one Cople and one Baldwin, my Lord of Shrewsbury's gent., required me that they might be suffered to indict one Walmesley, of Islington, an Inn-holder, for scandilation of my Lord, their master. They showed me two papers. The first was under the Clerk of the Council's hand of my Lord's purgation, in the which your good Lordship's speeches are specially set down. [The Council Minutes quoted ante, page 600.] The second paper was an examination of divers witnesses taken by Mr. Harris; the effect of all which was, that Walmesley should tell his guests openly at the table, that the Earl of Shrewsbury had gotten the Scottish Queen with child, and that he knew where the child was christened, and it was alleged that he should further add, that my Lord should never go home again, with like words, &c. An indictment was drawn by the Clerk of the Peace, the which I thought not good to have published, or that the evidence

should be given openly, and therefore I caused the jury to go to a chamber, where I was, and heard the evidence given, against whom one Merideth Hammer, a Doctor of Divinity, and Vicar of Islington, was a witness, who had dealt as lewdly towards my Lord in speeches as did the other, viz., Walmesley. This doctor regardeth not an oath. Surely he is a very bad man; but in the end the indictment was endorsed. *Billa vera.*"[1]

Thus was Shrewsbury still intent on punishing those who defamed him, and vindicating his character from the slanders originally set on foot by his wife and her sons.

There were also communications going on between the Queen of Scots and the Queen of England with a view to an accommodation of their differences, but the points at issue were the old ones, and the negotiations dragged their tedious and unending length along. At last, on the 3rd November, Queen Elizabeth had "grown to a full determination for the removal of the Scottish Queen" to Tutbury, and Walsingham sent to Sadler "a note of such points as her Majesty doth desire to be resolved in."[2]

The points were these: and Sadler's answers are dated "5 Nov., 1584, at Wingfield:"—

Q. 1. What number of persons will suffice to guard the Scottish Queen at Tutbury?

1 *Answer.* There are at Wingfield, at this present, of my Lord's servants, gentlemen, yeomen, and officers, about 120, and of Sir Ralph Sadler's about 50, and soldiers 40, together 210. Although Tutbury house be much larger than this, yet I think that 150 men will suffice to guard her there, and not under, for 15 or 16 must watch there nightly; and if there be fewer, their turns to watch would come too oft about.

[1] Fleetwood to Burghley.—*Wright*, v. 2, p. 241.

[2] Walsingham to Sadler, Nov. 3.—*Sadler Papers*, v. 3, p. 193.

Q. 2. Whether it shall be necessary to have any soldiers for the guarding of her, or whether the ordinary servants of the nobleman that shall have custody of her may not suffice, without any further charge to her Majesty?

A. 2. I think it necessary, that of the said 150 men, 40 or 50 of them at least must be soldiers.

Q. 3. If it shall be thought meet to have soldiers, then how many, and whether it were better for the ease of her Majesty's charges to give them the ordinary wages of 8d. a day, or meat and drink, with some allowance of wages?

A. 3. The first part is answered before; and for the second part, I think it better for easing of her Majesty's charge, to give them meat and drink, and some allowance of wages.

Q. 4. Whether the said soldiers may be lodged all within the castle?

A. 4. There is room enough as I hear, so as there be beds provided.

Q. 5. What number of horses were fit to be kept by the noblemen that shall have the guard of her?

A. 5. I think 40 or 50.

Q. 6. Whether the said Queen hath any horses of her own to serve for her coach and her gentlemen that attend on her; and at whose charge they are kept now?

A. 6. She hath four good coach horses of her own, and her gentlemen have six; whereof the four coach horses are kept at my Lord's charge.

Q. 7. What number of persons the said Queen hath attending on her?

A. 7. 48, viz., herself; five gentlemen, 14 servitors, three cooks, four boys, three gentlemen's men, six gentlewomen, two wives, ten wenches and children.

Q. 8. What number of chambers shall be thought meet to be furnished for the said Queen?

A. 8. She hath here for herself two, and for her maids three, besides two for two women that have their husbands here, and eight for her gentlemen officers and mean servants;

in all 15.—*Note.* That the two Secretaries, Master of the Household, her Physician, and De Prean, have several [separate] chambers, and so have always had.

Q. 9. What stuff she hath of her own, and how much remaineth serviceable of that which was sent unto her from her Majesty, whereof I send you a note, and how much were necessary to be supplied?

A. 9. She hath no stuff of her own, neither hangings, bedding, plate, napery, kitchen vessel, nor anything else, but occupieth all of my Lord's; and what is to be supplied I cannot judge, not knowing what shall be brought from Staffordshire; and as for the Queen's Majesty's stuff which was sent unto this Queen, it is told me that there is in a manner nothing of it serviceable, saving the hangings and a chair or two, but is worn and spent; besides much of the Earl's stuff that is also wasted and worn, as his officers say.

Q. 10. What the Queen of Scots' ordinary diet is, both fish and flesh days?

A. 10. About 16 dishes at both courses, dressed after their own manner. Sometimes more or less, as the provision serveth.

Q. 11. How many messes, besides her own diet, are served to the rest of her train; and in what sort the said messes are furnished, both fish days and flesh days?

A. 11. The two Secretaries, Master of her Household, the Physician, and De Prean, have a mess of seven or eight dishes, and do dine always before the Queen, and their own servants have their reversion; and the rest of her folk dine with the reversion of her meat. Also her gentlewomen and the two wives, and other maids and children, being sixteen, have two messes of meat of nine dishes at both courses, for the better sort, and five dishes for the meaner sort.

Q. 12. How the messes be furnished?

A. 12. That is answered next before.

Q. 13. At what rates and prices victuals may be provided in those parts, as also provision of horse meat?

A. 13. Wheat is about 20s. a quarter; malt about 16s. a

quarter; beef, a good ox, £4; mutton, a score, £7; veal and other meats reasonable good charge, about 8s.; hay, about 13s. 4d. a load; oats, the quarter, 8s.; peas, the quarter, about 12s.

Q. 14. What stable room is there at Tutbury Castle?

A. 14. Within the base court of the castle there is, as I hear, for about 40 horses; and in the town hard by, good room enough.

Q. 15. By what time the house may be put in readiness?

A. 15. I do not hear but that the house is in reasonable good reparation, saving glazing and some other small things, which shall be done out of hand; and for the time of readiness, that resteth upon the time of bringing the stuff and provisions thither.

Q. 16. In what place near Tutbury beer may be provided?

A. 16. At Burton, three miles off; and if Mr. Henry Cavendish's brewhouse in Tutbury may be borrowed, sufficient quantity of beer may be brewed there, and so the country much eased in carriage, besides the readiness. Here is to be considered to have provision made of sufficient plate, napery, and kitchen stuff, and all other implements of household, as for the buttery, pantry, chambers, &c.

Q. 17. What proportion of wine is spent by the said Queen and her train yearly?

A. 17. About ten tun a year.

Q. 18. As touching wood and coal, mentioned in your letter; the Queen's Majesty hath woods, good store, hard joining to Tutbury, whereof coal [charcoal] may be made. As for sea coal, which is much used in this country, and is counted their best fuel, there is none nearer than six miles from Tutbury, and order is already this day sent to make ready wood and coal there."[1]

Removal was resolved on, but it took much time and trouble to bring the resolution into effect. There was wardrobe stuff to borrow from Lord Paget, and

[1] *Sadler Papers*, v. 3, p. 194.

to procure from London. Mr. Agard was appointed to receive these things at Tutbury, and until the plate and linen could be sent down, it was thought Lord Shrewsbury might perhaps lend some for temporary use. Then, too, there was the question of the structural fitness of Tutbury to receive the Queen and her train; the preparations and alterations it might be necessary to make there, and the provision for the due supply of fuel, food, plate, linen, matting, carpets, wine and beer. Soldiers, also, had to be levied from the country around Tutbury, and Sadler proposed to send away the children of the Queen of Scots' attendants, and to change her coachman, whom he somewhat suspected of practices.

All these questions were under discussion during November and December. The time of removal was left very much to Sadler's discretion; and he was cheered in his irksome office by assurances of an early release. Efforts were made, without success, to induce Lord St. John of Bletso to accept the troublesome and anxious charge.[1] On the 3rd December, Queen Elizabeth wrote to the Queen of Scots, informing her that she had released the Earl of Shrewsbury, and had appointed Sir Ralph Sadler to take his place, with directions to remove her to Tutbury. The change, however, was not to be made in a manner prejudicial to the health of the Queen of Scots.[2]

On the 8th December, Sadler reported Tutbury to be ready, and urged the necessity for prompt

[1] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. xiv., Nos. 27, 33, 35, 37, 41, 42, 44, 45, 51, 64, 65.
[2] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. xiv., Nos. 66 and 67.

removal thither; but on the day following, Walsingham authorized a further delay, and instructed Sadler to get provisions at Wingfield, at her Majesty's expense, for ten days longer. On the 16th December, Sadler mentioned the excuses put forward by the Queen of Scots to gain further delay, and begged for instructions. On the 19th, he was requested not to set out until the return of Nau from London.[1]

Meanwhile, Sadler determined to satisfy himself as to the real state of Tutbury, about which the accounts were so conflicting, and the objections of the Queen of Scots so strong. Mr. Somer, his colleague and son-in-law, was accordingly instructed to repair thither, and, on the 21st December, he reported as follows, to Walsingham:—

"John Somer to Walsingham.

"Right Honourable,—After I had heard this Queen's and some of her people's mislike of Tutbury house, and yet much commended by other, sent thither to make report of it. I rode thither in the company of M. Curll, by Mr. Chancellor's[2] appointment, to see the state of it in reparations and fitness of convenient rooms for their lodgings. I found it made very light both in the principal lodgings, and the out-houses for offices, and some other lodgings within the inner court.

"Only, there lacked some little repair of glazing in some windows of a great tower, which Curll marked, for his own lodging is like to be there, but is now amended as I understand. Therefore Curll, writing to his fellow that the lodgings are out of order and reparations not meet to be used, hath done Mr. Chancellor great wrong, who by former letters hath certified her Majesty as he heard, and as is true, that the house is in good order that way. As to the lodgings appointed for this Queen, being the chiefest of the house, standing orderly to-

[1] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. xiv., Nos. 80, 81, 92, 95.
[2] Sadler of the Duchy of Lancaster.

gether, flanking all alongst a fair large green court, the prospect to the east very fair, and some to the west (but not far), as they are now ordered, by transposing of some partitions, sealing one chamber and by making of one chimney. There is a fair dining chamber about thirty-six feet long, joining to that a fair cabinet private with a chimney. Next to that, her bed-chamber, about twenty-seven feet long, for two beds and a pallet as she used to have, and within it a proper closet private, and other good rooms for the rest of her gentlewomen which lie not in her chamber, four or five. And for her grooms beside, and a convenient place for her people's table, besides a handsome room for a close stool, wood, coal, and other necessaries—all upon one floor and under one roof. And a private stair from the place of the coal down to an entry that leadeth to the rooms under all these, which are in number eight chambers great and small, whereof four have chimneys. And in the foresaid Tower (standing at the south end of these lodgings, having some space between), are three fair chambers with chimneys and necessaries, besides some other rooms not far off, in case of want. She shall have also a fair kitchen, with two ranges, and offices thereto belonging, and buttery and pantry, in one room private to herself. Very good water in a large (but deep) well at hand. So as surely there is appointed for her all the best lodgings of the house. The other standing scattering abroad, saving two double lodgings. The one in a tower somewhat aside, between the great chamber and the Queen's lodgings, which are appointed for my Lord St. John, if he will not mislike them for their greatness and coldness. And another double lodging at the lower end of the hall (standing all aloft upon a floor), which are meant for Mr. Chancellor, for the time of his being there. And then my Lord may have them, if he like not of the other.

"Thus, in my opinion, and as Curll confessed to me, she shall be very well lodged and accommodated in all things, howsoever he hath been content to seek to blemish it, as perhaps unwilling for some secret causes among themselves to go thither.

"The country round about it is champaign, very pleasant, fruitful, and commodious for all needful provisions at hand. I

call it England, for methinks here we be out of it in a wilderness. God bring us first thither, if we must go, and then shortly further southward. And so remembering my duty, I recommend you to his holy protection. From Wingfield, the twenty-first of December, 1584.

"Your Ho: humbly at commandment,

"JOHN SOMER.

"To the Right Honourable Sir Francis Walsingham, Knight, the Queen's Majesty's Principal Secretary."[1]

On the 4th January, 1585, it was known that Lord St. John definitely declined to be put in charge of the Queen of Scots, and the name of Sir Amias Poulet, Captain of Jersey, and formerly English Ambassador in France, was mentioned as a substitute.[2] This arrangement was not acceptable to the Queen of Scots, nor did the selection strike Sadler and Somer as a wise one. Hence arose remonstrances and counter suggestions, and, while these were passing between the Court and the country, the removal of the Queen of Scots was effected.

Secretary Nau returned from London early in the new year. On the 6th January, Sadler reported his arrival, and spoke of the satisfaction with which his mistress had received him.[3] Then were urged on the final preparations for departure. On Wednesday, the 13th, the royal captive left Wingfield. Sadler had been at much pains to decide on the best and least public route. He was anxious, if possible, to avoid the town of Derby, and sent several "servants of good judgment," as well as Mr.

[1] *MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. XIV., No. 98.

[2] Burghley to Walsingham, Jan. 4.—*MSS. Mary Q. of S.*, v. XV., No. 5.

[3] Sadler to Walsingham, Jan. 6.—*MSS. Mary Queen of Scots*, v. XV., No. 15.

Somer, "riding to Tutbury, to see if there were any way passable with coach and carriage," and also to look out for some gentleman's house in which to lodge the Queen for one night. As a result of their enquiries, the messengers reported "there was no other possible way for [a] coach but the common way, and scant that at that time of the year, by reason of hills, rocks, and woods." Sadler himself made trial of the roads for two or three miles, and finding the reports that had reached him to be true, "caused bridges to be made to avoid many evil passages."

No gentleman's house was available, for Mr. Knyeton's, at Mercaston, was small, and "very little means in that village." Sadler, therefore, was reluctantly compelled to pass through Derby, and spend the night with his charge at an inn in that town. The events of the night, and the precautions then taken, Sadler thus recounts:—

"Her entertainment was this. In the little hall was the goodwife, being an ancient widow, named Mrs. Beaumont, with four other women, her neighbours. So soon as she [Mary] knew who was her hostess, after she had made a beck to the rest of the women standing next to the door, she went to her and kissed her, and none other, saying that she was come thither to trouble her, and that she was also a widow, and therefore trusted that they should agree well enough together, having no husbands to trouble them; and so went into the parlour upon the same low floor, and no stranger with her but the goodwife and her sister. And there Mr. Somer staid, until the Queen put off her upper garment, and took other things about her. And further, so soon as she was within her lodging, the gentleman porter stood still at the door, to suffer none to go into the house but her own people from their lodgings next adjoining. And then I appointed the bailiffs to cause a good watch of honest householders to be

at all the corners of the town and in the market place, and eight to walk all night in the street where she lodged, as myself, lying over against that lodging, can well testify, by the noise they made all night."[1]

After the night's rest, taken under the circumstances thus recounted, the journey was resumed next morning, and on the evening of Thursday, January 14th, the Queen of Scots once more found herself in her old quarters at Tutbury. Six days afterwards, Mary wrote to Lord Burghley, protesting the sincerity of her love and loyalty to her good sister, and sending also a memorandum of her ordinary wants, which she thought would not be deemed too unreasonable, considering her rank. In a postscript, the Queen of Scots thus concluded:—

"Mr. High Treasurer, I pray you that the Queen, my good sister, may treat me as her own, and that she may excuse my importunity for the necessaries which I require; being the least to which I can willingly reduce and bring myself, having regard to the state of my health, which has made me feel, as I had always apprehended, this house in this season very inconvenient, being only built of plaster and wood badly joined, and furnished so ill that those who have charge of me here are forced to confess that they themselves have been ill-used; so that, in lodging and furniture, I find myself even worse off than I have ever previously been. But they give me hope of having it remedied; which I know well, a special recommendation will greatly promote. And were it not that it has pleased the Queen, my good sister, to take me into her own hands, I should not require it from others; these are petty matters, in consideration of what I hope to deserve from her. Especially I recommend my stable to you, without which I am more than ever a prisoner. Consider yourself what exercise can they take

[1] Sadler to Burghley, Feb. 5, 1584[5].—*Sadler Papers*, pp. 262-3.

who have worse legs than you, brought to that state from want of exercise, so that if I am deprived of it, life will not long remain to me."[1]

With this removal our task is ended. We set out with the intention of tracing the narrative of Queen Mary's captivity during the period of her residence under the care of the Earl of Shrewsbury, and on leaving Wingfield she quitted the roof of that nobleman for ever. It would be tempting and attractive enough to follow the story of her life during its two remaining years, but to do so would require an enlargement of the scope of this work; and, moreover, the ground has been already often traversed. During the time when Sir Amias Poulet and Sir Drue Drury were in charge of the Queen, when the Babington conspiracy was on foot, and when Elizabeth and Mary were doing their best or their worst to escape from the perplexities and difficulties of their position, there was interest and excitement enough to attract the attention of biographers and historians. There has been no lack of care bestowed on that portion of the life of the Queen of Scots, and, not the least valuable addition, is the recent publication of "The Letter Books of Sir Amias Poulet," edited by the Rev. John Morris.[2] Mr. Froude's picturesque narrative is of course familiar to all, but it needs to be read critically and with caution. Father Morris, in contrast to Mr. Froude, inclines to the Catholic view, and produces from the copies of letters written by Poulet and Drury, recently acquired by the Curators of the Bodleian

[1] *Turnbull*, p. 326. [2] London: Burns & Oates. 1874.

Library, striking evidence of the unworthy attempts of Elizabeth and her advisers to get rid of the Queen of Scots, otherwise than in due form of law. It was after Poulet, on the 2nd February, 1586-7, had repudiated with indignation, the proposal to assassinate the Queen, saying: "God forbid that I should make so foul a shipwreck of my conscience, or leave so great a blot to my poor posterity, to shed blood without law or warrant,"[2] that Elizabeth's Council resolved to dare all things, and despatched the death warrant without the formal and express sanction of their mistress.

Into these matters, as well as into the question of the Babington conspiracy, which brought all the intrigues of the Queen of Scots to a head, we do not enter. It will be manifest, however, from the preceding pages, that plots and intrigues were the familiar weapons of the Queen of Scots. One who could conspire, as we have seen her conspiring, with France and Spain, to levy war upon the Queen of England, at the time when she was making the fairest professions of amity and good faith, was not the person to hesitate, when the indiscretion of Babington, and the ardour of Gilbert Giffard, placed within her reach the attractions of a great and encouraging plot. That she was an accomplice with Babington and his companions cannot be doubted; and it was for the welfare of England that she should be restrained from further mischief. It does not concern us to justify the devices by which her evil practices were counteracted, or to commend the

[2] *Morris*, p. 362.

manners of the age that brought her to the block. Rough justice was done. A most dangerous person was removed from the realm; and by way of compensation for the sternness of Mary Stuart's treatment, her memory has been handed down to posterity surrounded with a fictitious halo arising from misfortune. The recollection of her evil deeds, and more evil designs, is obscured by her sad fate, and long as the page of history remains, Mary Stuart will enjoy an advantage over her successful rival in the sentimental regard of a kind-hearted people.

FINIS.

INDEX.

Alençon, Francis, Duke of, (created Duke of Anjou, 1st October, 1576,) marriage negotiations with Elizabeth, 411, 417, 464, 488; death of, 581; *mentioned*, 412, 424, 426, 427, 431, 440, 477.
Allen, Dr. William, head of the English seminary at Rheims, 363, note on 389; confers with the Jesuit missionaries, 502; Mary writes to, 580.
Allowance to Shrewsbury for keeping the Queen of Scots (see Diet Money).
Alva, the Duke of, correspondence with Queen of Scots, 55, 80, 169; begged to invade England, 129; his opinion of Elizabeth's marriage project, 170; Ridolfi accredited to, 171, 172; Mary sends thanks and prayers to, 174; dealings with Charles Bailly, 177, 178; *mentioned*, 39, 188, 263.
Amusements at Buxton, 303.
Amusements for a prisoner, 339.
Angus, Earl of, suggested marriage of, with Mary, 135.
Anjou, Henry, Duke of; Elizabeth objects to marriage with the Queen of Scots, 128; marriage negotiations with Queen Elizabeth, 169, 198; elected King of Poland, 301.
Aquilon, Secretary of the Spanish embassy at Paris, 361.
Archdall, Ralph, 148.
Archibald, Thomas, 142, 185 n.
Arden, a Warwickshire gentleman and Catholic conspirator, 542; executed, 543; Mary Stuart professes ignorance of, 562.
Argyle, the Earl of, 55, 129, 408, 410, 416.
Arran, the Earl of, 505.
Arundel, Charles, a Catholic conspirator, 542.
Arundel, Earl of, *mentioned*, 75, 119 n.
Arundel, Thomas, Earl of, 144.
Askham, Roger, 17.
Assassination of Elizabeth, suggested, 532, 534, 542, 543.
Association, the proposed, of Mary Stuart with James in the Scotch throne, 219, 454, 534; Mary's motives in proposing, 497; again suggested, 517.
Astloe, a physician sent to Sheffield, 158; returns to London, 163; preferred by Queen of Scots, 477.
Athol, Earl of, 408, 410, 416.
Atterlowe, a practiser, 358.

Babington, Anthony, 188, 620.
Babington conspiracy, 620.
Babington pedigree, 189 n.
Bacon, Shrewsbury's secretary, 71.
Bailly, Charles, secretary of the Bishop of Ross, seized with papers, 175; committed to Marshalsea, 176; betrayed by Herlle, the spy, 177; removed to the Tower and racked, 178.
Baines, Dick, a practiser, 334.
Baldwin, Thomas, agent to Shrewsbury, 442; letter to Shrewsbury, 445 n, 447; prepares for Shrewsbury's journey, 506; ordered to buy covering for stools and a silk jerkin, 519; letter from Shrewsbury, 537 n; sends ciphers to Curll, imprisoned, 603; prosecutes scandalmongers at Middlesex Sessions, 608; *mentioned*, 451, 458.
Barbary fowls, and small birds, for Queen of Scots, 339.
Barlboro, 32 n.
Barlow, Robert, of Barlow, 16.
Barker, secretary to the Duke of Norfolk, 172; his examination, 181 n.
Barsdale, Dr., a physician sent to the Queen of Scots, 504.
Bartholomew, the massacre of, 270.
Base, a footboy, 254.
Bassett, Mr., "beside Derby," 604.
Bastian, page, 6, 35 n., 36 n., 142, 185 n., 222.
Bastian's wife, 25 n., 31, 186 n., 204.
Bateman, John, Shrewsbury's secretary, 87, 115 n., 120, 199; describes the precautions at Sheffield, 200, 223; carries letters, 224; writes to Burghley, 225, 227, 254.

Battell, Elizabeth, waiting woman of Lady Shrewsbury's, letter about family quarrels, 551 n.
Beale, Robert, clerk to the Council, 364; sent to Sheffield, 468; biographical note, 468 n; his letters to Walsingham, 473; received by Mary in a darkened room, thinks her very ill, 478; in favour of sending physicians, 480; begs leave to return to London, 481; reports his conversation with Mary, 482-487; ordered back to Court, notes Mary's requests, sets out for London, 487; employed to draw Mary into engagements, 493; sent again to Sheffield, 519; finds Queen of Scots "waxen far grosser," 521; conversation with Nau in the garden, 525; returns to London, 526; returns to Sheffield with Mildmay, 527; sent to London with letters, 529; writes to Shrewsbury, 530 n; returns to Sheffield, 578; thinks Mildmay should have power to conclude a treaty, 579; endeavours to compose differences between Shrewsbury and his son, 586.
Beaton, Andrew, successor to John, 185 n., 200; proposes to marry Mary Seaton, 378; dies, 379.
Beaton, Archie, 35 n., 142, 185 n., 334.
Beaton, John, 5, 35 n.; death of, 137, 141.
Beaumont, Mrs., innkeeper at Derby, 617.
Bedford, Earl of, *mentioned*, 123, 324.
Beef, price of, 612.
Beer at Burton, 612.
Beighton, John, soldier, 236.
Belton (see Beaton).
Bentall, gentleman porter at Sheffield Castle, 236, 537, 538, 605.
Bishop Thomas, 38.
Blake, William, 185 n.
Bog, Ellen, Master Cook's wife, 186 n.
Bog, John, fruiterer, 186 n.
Bog, or Boge, Alexander, servant of the Queen of Scots, 35 n, 48, 49, 57, 58, 59, 96, 186 n.
Bolton, 21 n., 22; route from Bolton to Tutbury, 25; departure rom, 26.
Bolton Castle, Yorkshire, 2, 4 n.; Mary reaches, 9; described by Knollys, 9.
Bona, John de, pastler, 35 n.
Bonnar, Gilbert, horse keeper, 186 n.
"Boots," the torture of, 485.
Borthwick, or Bothwik, 35 n,, 37, 49.
Bortyque (see Borthwick)
Bothwell, the Earl of, his dying declaration, 374; *mentioned*, 10, 21 n., 124.
Bourgoing, physician to the Queen of Scots, describes her symptoms, 437 n.
Bowes, Sir Robert, sent by Elizabeth to Scotland, 453.
Boyd, Lord, 37, 38.
Boyes, Jhan du, pastelar, 185 n.
Bradgate, near Leicester, 16.
Breton, a milliner, 340.
Bright, Thomas, soldier, 236.
Bromley, Sir Thomas, solicitor general, 262.
Broshire, Florens, tapisser, 35 n.
Brough, near Castleton, *mentioned*, 145.
Brownells, soldiers, 236.
Bruce, Mary, 6, 141, 185 n.
Brusse, or Bruce, Mr., 185 n.
Buchanan, George, 10; his "Detection," 224.
Burghley, Lord, 172, 176; receives letters from Herlle, 177; cautions Shrewsbury against plots, 179; writes to Shrewsbury about Ridolfi's proceedings, 192; receives letter from John Gordon, 202; writes to Shrewsbury, urging circumspection, 206; the Scottish Queen's writing and the ciphers, 212; of Norfolk's affairs, 213; about ciphered letters, 252; uneasy, Aug., 1572, 265; appointed Lord Treasurer, 267; writes to Shrewsbury, 267; speaks of massacre of St. Bartholomew, 269; slanders against Shrewsbury, 281; accepts his assurances, 282; Elizabeth suspicious of, 362; visits Buxton, 362; returns to London, 364; illness, 373; visits Buxton, 387, 388; makes small account of rumours of Mary's escape, 399; said to be favourable to Mary, 436; present at Council Meeting, 600; *mentioned*, 424, 442, 443.
Burley, Thomas, a glover in Sheffield, and practiser for the Queen of Scots, 334, 335.
Burton-on-Trent, 38, 44, 612.
Butler, Margaret, 291.
Buxton, 15; Shrewsbury goes there without leave, 71; Mary asks leave to go, 184; proposed visit, 266; Mary desires to visit, 298; goes there, 302; Jones's description of the wells, 303; amusements at, 303; Mary removed to, 333, 377; Leicester visits, 383; Nau and Burghley visit, 387; Mary taken to, 446, 505, 582; Mary's farewell to, 584; *mentioned*, 362, 363, 369, 374, 437, 445.

Caithness, Bishop of, granted Earldom of Lennox, 407.
Caldwell, a schoolmaster, 252.
Campian, a Jesuit missionary, 439; executed, 496.
Carlile, Christopher, naval adventurer, 518.
Carlisle, Mary arrives at, 3; *mentioned*, 9, 19, 62, 64.
Carmychaell, Elizabeth, 185.
Carre, Tomme, 182.
Casket letters, the, 9; originals exhibited privately, in what language written, 10; Hosack's opinion of, 11 n; *mentioned*, 27.
Castel, physician, 185 n.; writes to Burghley, 228 n.
Castle Hay Park, Shrewsbury desires fuel from, 108.
Catholic Conspiracy, 462; for Invasion of England, assassination of Elizabeth, establishment of Mary Stuart, 532; plans of Invasion, 540; conspirators arrested, 542; plot disclosed, 543; projects discussed by De Tassis, 580.
Catholics, English, said to desire foreign aid against Elizabeth, 499.
Catholics, penal laws against, 449.
Cavendish, Charles, 551, 556, 577.
Cavendish, Elizabeth, marriage with Charles, Earl of Lennox, 345, 365, (see Lennox).
Cavendish, Henry, 17, 292, 365.
Cavendish, Mary, 17, 365.
Cavendish, Sir William, 15, 16, 17.
Cawdwell, a physician, sent to Wingfield, 65.
Ceaton, Mary (see Seaton.)
Cecil, Elizabeth, Burghley's daughter, 362.
Cecil, Mr. Thomas, 388.
Cecil, Sir William, 1; letters from Knollys, 4, 21, 22; letters from Mary, 28, 36; letter from Knollys, 32 n.; from Shrewsbury and Knollys, 33; letter from N. White, 40; Mary's opinion of, 43; his opinion of N. White, 44; writes to Shrewsbury, 59, 60 n., 64; describes Shrewsbury's illness to Sir John Norris, 69; allows explanation of pistolets, 90; writes Shrewsbury and Huntingdon, 91; to Shrewsbury, 94; to Sadler, 100; sketches possible treaty with Mary; its terms, 118; sent to Chatsworth along with Mildmay, 132; returns to London, 134; writes to Shrewsbury, 135; note of treaties begun and abandoned, from 1568 to 1570, 161 n.; created Baron Burghley, 172. (See Burghley.)
Chalmers, George, "Life of Mary Queen of Scots," edition 1818, quoted, 4, 6, 8, 69, 396.
Chambers, C. & Co., *mentioned*, 146 n.
Chambers, number needed for Queen of Scots, 610.
Chapman, Thomas, soldier, 236.
Charles IX. (see King of France.)
Chatelherault, the Duke of, 8, 48, 49, 55, 57, 58, 129.
Châteauneuf, L'Aubespine de, 368.
Chatsworth, Queen of Scots removed to and returns from, 66; suggested removal, 116; Mary removed to; its history, 121; Mary's bower, 66, 122; Cecil and Mildmay sent to, 133; Mary's departure from, 140, 413; returns to, 299, 379, 383, 400, 410, 421, 465; *mentioned*, 5, 15, 120, 132, 144 n., 345, 393, 420, 423, 445, 448, 466.
Chérelles, secretary of Mauvissière, bribed by Walsingham, 535.
Chesterfield, 26; Mary arrives at, 32.
Chesterfield fair, 507.
Chiffland, D——, 185 n.
Chistard, Didye, 35 n.
Chopping-stone, Mary compares herself to, 572.
Coach for the Queen of Scots, 476, 488.
Coal, sea, used at Tutbury, 612.
Cobbard, John, 196.
Cobham, Lord, 95, 175, 177, 213.
Cock fight, Shrewsbury attends a, 524.
Cockayne, Sir Thomas, 604.
Cockermouth, 3.
Cockyn, Henry, a London bookselle: and a practiser, 333, 336, 337, 338 355, 358.
Collomnius, Mr. Arnold, surgeon, 35 n.
Comet appears over Windsor, 402.
Conduit Plain, Sheffield Park, 148.
Conjurers and mass mongers, 284.
Constable, holds lease of land at Sheffield, 442.
Convocation, two houses of, 259.
Cootes, Thomas, gentleman porter at Sheffield Castle, 212.
Corker, Thomas, chaplain to Shrewsbury. 321, 323, 324.
Council, Shrewsbury's "testimonial" from, 599.
Courcelles, Mistress, 185 n.
Coutberd, John, 252.
Coventry, Bishop of, preaches before Queen Mary, 114.
Coventry, Queen of Scots removed to, 100, note on 101; leaves, 107.

Cox, J. C., "Churches of Derbyshire." *quoted*, 199.
Crawford, of Jordanhill, 132, 174.
Crawfort, or Crawford, the carver, 35 n.
Creighton, a Jesuit missionary, 496; thinks the demands of Lennox rather exaggerated, 498; admits Catholic prospects in Scotland are not encouraging, 499; secret conferences, 502.
Creswick, Edward, soldier, 236.
Cristles, John, 35 n.
Croix, M. de la, 22 n.
Cromwell, Ralph, Lord, 51.
Crosses, still standing, 574.
Curll, or Courll, Gilbert, 35 n., 185 n., 379, 479, 480, 603.
Curzon, Mr., High Sheriff of Derbyshire, 604.

Dacre, Leonard, plots for Mary's escape, 56.
Darcy, Lord, of Aston, 585, 604.
Dardoye, Mons., 264.
Darnley, Lord, *mentioned*, 6, 11, 78, 124, 128, 453.
Darwin, Thomas, soldier, 236.
Davidson, sent to Scotland, 515.
Dawid, Bastian's boy, 186 n.
Deckinson, John, servant to Shrewsbury, 151 n., 391.
Derby, Queen of Scots sleeps at, 33, 617.
Derby, the Earl of, two sons plot for Mary's escape, 131; a relative of Mary's, 576.
Devonshire, the Duke of, 393, 394.
Diet money, allowed to Shrewsbury, 34, 35, 295, 364, 442, 450, 451, 455, 458, 472, 487, 490, 504.
Diet, ordinary, of the Queen of Scots, 459, 611.
Dogs, little, desired by Queen of Scots, 345.
Dolu, M., treasurer to the Queen of Scots, 374, 397, 401, 438.
Doncaster, the Red Bull at, 335; posts to, 590.
Dorset, the Marquis of, 17.
Douglas, Archibald, 485; deceiving both Walsingham and Mary Stuart, 535.
Douglas, George, 189 n., 190, 191, 212, 335, 467, 484.
Douglas, Willie, 5, 35 n., 185 n., 190, 209.
Downes, Henry, servant to Shrewsbury, 110.
Dowry, the Queen of Scots, plundered, 287; amount of, 295; French proceedings, 297-317, 328, 345, 364, 378, 438, 450, 456, 465, 487, 490; Mary confers with Du Ruisseau about, 509; state of, 529; Mary treats with Maron, 568; grants all he asks, 574.
Drury, Sir Drue, joined with Poulet in charge of Queen of Scots, 619.
Dumbarton Castle, 118, 132; capture of, 174; documents seized and sent to London, 174; Queen of Scots makes small account of the loss, 182; Duke of Lennox flies to, 505; *mentioned*, 453.
Dumfrys, John, 185 n.
Durham, the Bishop of, lends horses, 27.
Durham, rebels at, 98.
Duval, a physician, 421.

Earthquake at Sheffield, 355.
Edensor, 6, 137, 142.
Edinburgh Castle, seige of, 289; capture of, 293; *mentioned*, 453.
Edmond, Father, 327, 413.
Ellis's "Original Letters," *quoted*, 358.
Elizabeth, Queen, sends letters to Mary, 3; letters to Shrewsbury, 31 n, 125, 126; letters to Mary, 36 n, 48; enquires how Mary digests news from Scotland, 48; panic on hearing of Shrewsbury's ague, 67; rebukes Shrewsbury for going to Buxton, 72; sanctions Mary's removal to Sheffield, 74; scolds Norfolk, 81; precautions against Mary's escape, 81; orders to stop all messages or letters, 85; writes soothing letter to Shrewsbury, 87; instructs Shrewsbury and Huntingdon to question Mary, 88; allows explanation of incident of pistolets, 90; orders Mary to be kept from all intelligence, 91; complains of Shrewsbury's treatment of Huntingdon, 91; hints doubts of Lady Shrewsbury's loyalty, 93; renews her cautions, 94; gives Huntingdon leave to depart, 95; orders Shrewsbury to return to Tutbury, 106; prefers Wingfield to Chatsworth, 116; lays waste Scottish border, 117; renews negotiations with Mary, 118; excommunication of, 120; gives permission for Mary to ride and take the air, 126; resolves to send Cecil and Mildmay to Chatsworth, 132; cautions Cecil, 133; her letter to Mary, 132; decides to remove her to Sheffield, 138; cautions Shrewsbury, 165, 181; matrimonial negotiation with the Duke of Anjou,

169, 170, 198; writes to Mary, 179; on the discovery of Mary's practices, 192; urges on Shrewsbury increased vigilance, 217; releases Sadler from his charge at Sheffield, 249; declines to put Mary to death, 259; prorogues parliament, 260, 372; sends Commissioners to Sheffield, 262; orders straight keeping of Mary, 271, 273; reports of her having small-pox, 276; re-assures Shrewsbury, 277; her disgraceful proposals to the Scots, 278; her allowance to Shrewsbury, 295; proposes Mary should defray her own charges, 296, 359, 456; authorises Mary's removal to Buxton, 300; doubts Shrewsbury's fidelity, 307; receives favourably present of embroidery from Queen of Scots, 329, 357; anger at the Lennox-Cavendish marriage, 347; approves Nau as secretary to the Queen of Scots, 358; conversation with La Mothe, 359; jealousy against Burghley, 362; various perplexities, 369; receives petticoat and sleeves from the Queen of Scots, 372; consults authorities on the succession, 373; seemingly in love with Leicester, 385; her ridiculous letter to Shrewsbury, 385 n.; urges Shrewsbury to be more heedful, 400 n.; encourages the rebels in the Low countries, 404; resolves to remove the Queen of Scots to Ashby, 404; abandons the resolution, 405; reported illness, 408; gives bad reception to M. de Gondy; jokes with her intimates, 409; marriage negotiations with Anjou, 411, 417; unwilling to break off the negotiations, 419; visited by Anjou, 425; courtship in full course, 426; questions Lord Talbot, 439; forbids Shrewsbury's children to live near Mary, 445; issues proclamation against the Jesuits, 449; consternation at the arrest of Morton, 453; efforts to save him, 454; marriage negotiations with Anjou, 464, 488; replies to Mary's requests, 491; sends unofficial letter, 492; sends Davidson into Scotland, 515; instructs Shrewsbury and Beale to answer Mary's complaints, 519; states her grounds of offence, 520; sends Mildmay to negotiate with Queen of Scots, 526; resolves not to send alone into Scotland, 529; sees the proposed association is unacceptable to James and his nobles, 534; Catholic conspiracy to assassinate, discovered, 541; outburst of loyalty towards, 545; complains to French Ambassador of foreign plots, 560; replies to Mary's complaints and protestations of innocence, 562; issues formal orders to Sadler and Nevill to take charge of Mary Stuart, 566; changes plan and renews negotiations, 568; sends Beale to Sheffield, 577; breaks off negotiations, 579; her grief at the death of Anjou, 581; appoints Sadler and Somer to relieve Shrewsbury, promises to release Sadler as soon as may be, 585; resolves to send Mary to Tutbury, 609; informs her of the release of Shrewsbury, 613.

Embroidery, Queen of Scots works at, 42, 318.

English language used in conversations with Mary, 41, 521, 569.

Erskeyn, the Master of, reports James' sayings to his mother, 485.

Evelyn, John, "Sylva," *quoted*, 147, 148, 149.

Excommunication of Elizabeth, 120.

Fabian, secretary to French ambassador, 266.

Falconer, a conjuring scholar, 284.

Farrier, 35 n.

Fénélon, M. de la Mothe (see La Mothe).

Feria, Duke and Duchess of, 187, 188.

Fichar, Nicholl, 185 n.

Firth's farm, Sheffield, 147.

Fitzherbert, Sir Thomas, 204 n.

Fitzwilliam, George, 186, 187.

Fleming, Lord, sent to London, 3.

Fletewood, Recorder of London, 363, 608.

Foljambe, Sir Francis, 33 n.

Foljambe, or Fullgham, Godfrey, 26, 32; Queen of Scots spends two nights with, 33; *mentioned*, 604.

Foljambe, Thomas, 33 n.

Foljambe's next land, pestilence in, 120.

Forest, M. de la, French Ambassador, 19, 50.

Formew, Gary, comptroller, 35 n.

Fotheringhay, *mentioned*, 158, 598.

Fowler, Thomas, servant to Margaret Countess of Lennox, 412 n.

Fowler, William, in the pay of Walsingham, 535.

France, King of (Charles IX. to 30th May, 1574; Henry III. to 1589); remonstrates against Mary's treatment, 95; accredits an envoy, 126; death

of Charles IX., 351, 410; rejoices at Morton's death, 454; urges Mary to accord title of king to her son, 466; remonstrates with Elizabeth, 515; sends La Mothe and De Maigneville into Scotland, 515; recognises the hopelessness of Mary's position, 530; endeavours to bring Scotch factions into accord, 534.
France, treaty with, 259.
Francis, a physician, sent to Wingfield, 65, 68, 69, 70, 73.
Francoys, servant of Castel, the physician, 186 n.
French negotiations in Scotland, 517.
Fretton, William George, *quoted*, 101 n.
Frogat, Godfrey, 147.
Froude, James Anthony, 10; his "History of England," ed. 1870, *quoted*, 62, 75, 76, 78, 80, 81, 133 n, 180 n.
Fuel, supply of, 108, 612.

Galloway, the Bishop of, receives instructions about a treaty, 160; *mentioned*, 185, 186, 200.
Gargrave, Mr., 182.
Gargrave, Sir Thomas, 25, 251, 308.
Gartleye, Laird of, 35 n.; 62, 186 n.
Gaulona, Glawd, baker, 35 n.
Giffard, Gilbert, conspirator, 620.
Giffard, servant of Countess of Kent, 147
Girarde, Florans, 35 n.
Glasgow, the Archbishop of, *mentioned*, 113, 354, 376, 383 n, 398, 416, 423, 428, 431 to 439, 449, 453, 460, 463, 467, 484, 502; his zeal approved, 440.
Gonar, M. de Saint, 430.
Gondy, Count of Retz, envoy from the King of France, badly received by Elizabeth, 409.
Good, a physician sent to Sheffield, 158; returns to London, 163.
Goodyeare's boy, 134
Gordon, John, supernumerary servant to the Queen of Scots, 201, 209.
Gout, Shrewsbury suffers from, 68, 74, 81, 474, 573.
Grame, Cristiane, 186 n.
Grange (see Kirkaldy).
Gray, John, a practiser, 334.
Gree, a brewer, 252.
Grey, Lady Jane, 17.
Gryne, Robert, 254.
Guest, John, "Historic notices of Rotherham," edition, 1879, 30 n.
Guise, the Cardinal of, 362, 371.
Guise, the Duke of, 409, 412, 424, 428, 440, 449, 450, 455, 502, 532; need of money, 533; instructions about invasion of England, 539, 540.
Hadfield, Charles, *quoted*, 153, 155.
Hadfield & Son, architects, restore part of Sheffield Lodge, 153.
Hair, colour of the Queen of Scots', 43.
Hales' house at Coventry, 102.
Hall, a missionary priest, 542; executed, 543.
Hall, or Herlle, John, a plotter for Mary's escape, 131, 204.
Hall Park, near Rivelin, 147, 149.
Halton, Mr., 149.
Hamilton, Alexander, tutor to Shrewsbury's sons, and secret agent of the Queen of Scots, 334 to 338, 355, 358.
Hamilton of Bothwellhaugh assassinates Murray, 113.
Hamilton, Claude, 174, 434.
Hamilton, Lord Claud, 381.
Hamilton, the Duke of, 254.
Hamilton, Master of the Household, 5.
Hamilton, Robert, 186 n.
Hammer, Merideth, vicar of Islington, defames Shrewsbury, 609.
Hana, Astyan, master cook, 35 n.
Handsworth, Thomas Corker, rector of, 321; Shrewsbury's house, at, 334.
Handwriting, Shrewsbury's, 182; Arabella Stuart's, 528; Mary Stuart's, 513.
Hardwick, Elizabeth (see Countess of Shrewsbury.)
Hardwick Hall, Derbyshire, 15, 16, 32, 393, 394.
Hardwick, John, 16.
Harrison, John, survey of Sheffield Manor, 144.
Hartington, the Marquis of, 393.
Hastings, Sir George, 56.
Hatton, Sir C., present at council meeting, 600.
Hauet, Estien, escuyer, 185 n.
Hawkesworth, William, yeoman porter to Shrewsbury, quarrels with Bentall; sent for by Sadler, 607.
Hawkesworths, soldiers, 236.
Hawkins, Mr., 518.
Hawkins, Sir John, 186.
Hawks, present of, to Shrewsbury, 110.
Hay, price of, 612.
Hayne's State papers, *quoted*, 124, 126.
Henry III. (see King of France.)
Hereford, Viscount, ordered to assist Shrewsbury, 81; arrived at Wingfield, 82; joint custodian with Shrewsbury and Huntingdon, 85; recalled to Tutbury, 99.
Herlle, William, a spy, 176, 177.
Herries, Lord, sent to London, 3; "the cunning horse leech," 5; *mentioned*, 34 n., 36 n., 57, 126 n, 486.

Herrington, Captain, refused passage at Berwick, 492.
Hewyt, or Huet, Martin, a cook, 35 n., 142, 185 n.
Hickford, secretary to the Duke of Norfolk, 180.
Hicks, Nicholas, 147.
Hog, Christilie, 186 n.
Holland, John, "Sheffield Park," *quoted*, 152.
Holt, a Jesuit missionary, 496, 502.
Home, Adryan, 222.
Horses and horsekeepers, 35 n.; number required, 610.
Hosack, John, "Mary Queen of Scots and her accusers." edition 1869, *quoted*, 10, 11, 28, 63.
Howard, Lord Henry, 358; arrested, 542
Howarth, a clergyman, 321.
Hudson, Edward, soldier, 236.
Hunsdon, Lord, 60; obstructed by rebels, 99; urges Elizabeth to send aid to Earl of Sussex, 100; sends warning, 253.
Hunter, Joseph, 18, 32; paper before Society of Antiquaries, *quoted*, 144 n., 146 n.; his "History of Hallamshire;" the Rev. Dr. Gatty's edition, 1869, *quoted*, 19, 20, 152, 157, 213, 293, 323, 350, 363, 369, 383, 390, 421, 442, 452; his opinion of the scandal letters, 557.
Huntingdon, Earl of, ordered to assist Shrewsbury, 81; arrives at Wingfield, 82; sees Queen of Scots, 83; instructed to supersede Shrewsbury, 84; found nothing suspicious, 85; joint commissioner with Shrewsbury and Hereford, 85; his pretensions to the succession, 86; instructed to question Mary, 88; writes to Cecil, 89; explains incident of pistolets, 90; complaint about lodgings, 91; nothing imparted plainly, 92; leave to depart, 95; recalled to Tutbury, 99; assists to remove Mary to Coventry, 101; complains of Shrewsbury, 103; writes to Cecil, 104; relieved of his charge, 106; reports a plot for liberating Mary, 287; on the look out for practices, 308; *mentioned*, 82, 123, 404.
Huntly, the Earl of, 129.
Hulls, or Huylly, Balthaser, 35 n., 185 n.

Ingram, Sir Arthur, 33 n.
Invasion of England, plans for, 540.
Inventory of household goods at Sheffield Castle and Sheffield Manor, 151, 505 n.

Jailheur, servant of Shrewsbury's, 437, 438, 440, 450.
James VI., King of Scots, proposed removal into England, 118, 128; plans to remove to Dumbarton and thence abroad, 439; marriage projects, 440; writes to Elizabeth, 494; seized by Gowrie and others, 505; regains his liberty, 532; projects for his marriage, 596; *mentioned*, 407, 422, 434, 461.
Janet, a practiser, 336.
Jerkin, a silk, for Shrewsbury, 519.
Jesuit missionaries, 439; proclamation against, 449; intrigues of, 468, 496; Mary doubts their prudence, 502; Philip's advice to, 504.
John, Don, of Austria, 380.
John, the musician, a practiser, 334.
Jones, Dr., describes Buxton, 303.
Jos, Marcial de, 265.
Journey from Sheffield to London, cost of, 599 n.
Julio, a physician, 418.

Keller, Avery, 284.
Kennett, Mistress, 185 n.
Kettericke, Wm., servant to Shrewsbury, 151 n.
Killigrew's negotiations to surrender Mary to the Scots, 278, 336.
Kirkaldy of Grange, 252.
Knaresborough, rebels at, 98.
Knite, Jane, servant of the Queen of Scots, in love with Andrew Martin, 451.
Knollys, Sir Francis, 2 · leaves for Carlisle, 3; writes to Cecil, 4; to Elizabeth, 4; describes Mary's waiting-women, 6; begs Elizabeth's plain resolution, 7; describes Bolton, 9, 20; tired of his post, 21; his wife dies, 22; thinks a zealous bishop needed in Yorkshire, 23; writes from Pontefract, 28, 32; letter to Cecil from Chesterfield, 32 n.; from Tutbury, 33; transfers Queen of Scots to Shrewsbury, 34; short of money, 34, 37; conducts Norfolk to the Tower, 88; *mentioned*, 27, 70, 119.
Knollys, Henry, 20 n., 43, 44.
Knollys, William, 2.
Knyeton, Mr., of Mercaston, 617.
Kynlough, Theo., 252.

Labanoff, Prince, on Foljambe's house, 32, 37 n; his opinion of the scandal letter, 552; "Recueil des Lettres de Marie Stuart," edition 1844, *quoted*

1, 27, 29, 30, 48, 57, 62, 80, 112, 117, 120, 124, 134, 138, 139, 161, 163, 164, 166, 169, 171, 173-4, 191, 197, 202, 257, 289, 297, 304, 306, 308, 318-20, 327, 329, 331, 333, 339-40, 342-45, 351-2, 354, 357, 362, 368, 370-1, 374-5, 377-9, 381, 389, 393, 399, 404, 408, 409-13, 415, 421, 425, 433, 435-6, 440-1, 448-50, 455, 460-1, 465-6, 493-4, 510-11, 513-15, 536, 549, 560, 562, 565-6, 583, 584.
Lackies, 35 n.
Lacon, Rowland, 284.
Ladie, Robert, the Queen's lacquey, 186 n.
Ladies' Oak, 148.
La Mothe Fénélon, 22 n.; letter to King, 34 n.; dates of appointment and departure, 50; writes to King, 62; on the Norfolk marriage, 78; about searching Mary's coffers, 89; sends Mary's letters written without light, 95; reports Mary is better treated, 96; recalled from England, 367; sent into Scotland, 515; negotiations there, 534; *mentioned*, 318-21, 329, 348, 350, 354, 355, 357-59, 366.
Lander, James, 185 n.
Lander's (James) son, 186 n.
Lassells, Bryan, 214.
Lassells, Hersey, 214.
Lauder, James, 336.
Ledar, servant of the Queen of Scots, 254.
Leicester, Bradgate near, 16.
Leicester, Earl of, writes about massacre of St. Bartholomew, 270; writes Shrewsbury about his sons, 292; examines Thomas Corker, 321; receives presents from Queen of Scots, 330; contemplates offering matrimony to the Queen of Scots, 340; visits Buxton, 383; sounds the Queen of Scots as to his marriage with Queen Elizabeth, 384; can do little for Queen of Scots, 403; complains of the Queen of Scots' diet, 459 n.; condolence with Shrewsbury on death of Francis Talbot, 507 n.; Lady Shrewsbury's designs for his son, 551; referred to in scandal letter, 554; death of his son, 587; present at Council meeting, 600; *mentioned*, 74, 75, 88, 91, 106, 119, 120, 135, 347, 373.
Leland's mention of Wingfield, 51.
Lemon, Robert, note on one of Mary's letters, *quoted*, 513.
Lennox, Charles, marriage with Elizabeth Cavendish, 345, 365; pedigree, 367; death of, 378; *mentioned*, 381.
Lennox, Earldom of, granted to Bishop of Caithness, 407.
Lennox, the Duke of (see Esmé Stuart).
Lennox, Elizabeth, Countess of, her marriage, 345, 365; her death, 490; mentioned in Mary's scandal letter, 554.
Lennox, Margaret, Countess of, 124; remonstrates against sending Mary back to Scotland, 129; danger in "parlementying," 131; cautions Cecil, 133; marries her son to Elizabeth Cavendish, 345; imprisoned, 349; death of, 406; *mentioned*, 366.
Lennox, Matthew, the Earl of, remonstrates against treaty with Mary, 131; selling Mary's jewels, 138; *mentioned* 191.
Leslie, John, Bishop of Ross, lodged at Wingfield, 56; asks for physicians for his mistress, 65; in negotiation with Elizabeth, 75; heads and articles agreed to with the nobility, 76; writes to Leicester, 106; says Mary's life is in danger, 106; arrested, 113; liberated, 118; visits Chatsworth, 122; his advice, 123; carries packet of letters, 123; returns to London, 124; complains Mary is not permitted to take the air abroad, 126; presses the negotiation, 132; accompanies Cecil and Mildmay to Chatsworth, 133; describes result of negotiation to Norfolk, 134; takes two physicians to Sheffield, 158; receives instructions about treaty, 160; planning Mary's escape, 172; tampers with treasonable papers seized by Lord Cobham, 175; again arrested, 178; his plot with Sir H. Percy, 180; sent for, 213; difference with his cook, 229; released from confinement, and retires to France, 307; negotiates at Paris, 361; Spanish opinion of, 361; negotiates with the Pope, 415; writes to King of Spain, 416; *mentioned*, 5, 10, 34, 36 n., 37, 38, 44, 49, 55, 56, 59, 80, 88, 112, 120, 126, 127, 333, 484.
Leslie, servant of the Bishop of Ross, visits Sheffield, 307, 355, 356 n.
Lethington (see Maitland).
Leverett, Shrewsbury's physician, 46.
Leviston, or Levingstoun, John, 31, 35 n., 186 n.
Liddell, Robert, 336.
Lindesay, Jannet, 186 n.
Lindsay, Lord, 486.
Lingard's "History of England," *quoted*, 543 n.
Livingstone, or Leinstoun, Lord, 5, 35 n., 44, 126, 160, 185 n., 207.

Livingstone, George, 186 n.
Livingstone, Lady, 5, 25 n.; ill at Rotherham, 30; accommodation at Tutbury, 31; *mentioned*, 32 n., 45, 141, 185 n., 207, 254, 289, 335.
Livingstone, Mistress, 185 n.
Livingstone, Thomas, 126 n., 185 n., 200.
Lodge, Edmund, "Illustrations of British History," ed. 1791, *quoted*, 14-18, 47, 59, 60, 64, 72, 74, 85, 91, 94, 96, 117, 137, 180, 206, 207, 212-214, 252, 266, 268-270, 273, 275-7, 281-2, 284-5, 287-290, 292, 296, 299, 301, 307, 322-3, 330-31, 344, 347, 350, 351, 355-6, 363, 369-70, 374, 377, 382, 385, 387-8, 408-9, 419, 421, 439, 442 to 448, 451, 456, 458-9, 490-92, 506-9, 518, 527, 530, 588, 600.
Longston, Rowland, soldier, 236.
Lord's Oak, in Rivelin, 148, 149.
Lorraine, Cardinal of, 287, 351, 354, 357, 358, 362.
Lossellewr, Gwyon, 35 n.
Loudham, Margaret, daughter of Sir John, 33 n.
Lowret, physician, 184.
Lowther, Richard, 1, 3,
L'Oyselon, Guyon, 185 n.
Luller and the Lulled, Mary knows who is, 564.
Lumley, Lord, 175, 180.
Lyddell, servant of the Queen of Scots, 327.
Lyson's Derbyshire, *quoted*, 303.

Machin, Thomas, soldier, 236.
Mackinson, Robert, 35 n., 200, 201.
Madard, Piere, potiger, 185 n.
Magson, Jo, 148.
Maigneville, M. de, sent with La Mothe to Scotland, 515; negotiates there, 534.
Maitland, of Lethington, advises Mary to make the best terms she can, 130; death of, 295n.; *mentioned*, 134, 252, 265, 486.
Maldonado, Diego, Spanish representative at Paris, 460.
Mallery, Sir William, 25.
Malreson, Andro, 185 n.
Malt, price of, 611.
Man, Isle of, projected escape to, 132.
Manners, Gertrude, Countess of Shrewsbury, 13, 539.
Manners, Mr. John, 604.
Manners, Mr. Roger, 251, 388.
Magarnie, Mr., "medesiner," 35 n.
Maron, M., seneschal of Poitou, treats with Mary about her dowry, 568; remarks on churches and crosses in England, 574.
Marr, Regent, declines Elizabeth's proposals, 278; death of, 279.
Marriage negotiations of Elizabeth, 169, 198, 411, 417, 419, 426, 439, 464, 488; Philip seeks to hinder, 495.
Martin, or Marvyn, Andrew, servant to Shrewsbury, in love with Jane Knite, 451; sent to London, 452.
Mary Queen of Scots lands at Workington, 1; her chamber at Carlisle, 2; without change of clothes, 3; wardrobe replenished, 4; servants, 5; threatens to seek aid from France or Spain, 8; reaches Bolton, 9; passes into hands of Shrewsbury, 19; describes Tutbury, 23; utensils, 25 n; departure from Bolton, 26; receives Sir R. Melville at Ripon, 27; projects of marriage with Norfolk, 27; writes from Pontefract to Cecil, 28, 29; from Rotherham to the Archbishop of St Andrews, 30; pain in her side, 30; journeys in pain to Chesterfield, 32; spends two nights at Mr. Foljambe's house, 33; reaches Tutbury, 33; attendants reduced, 34, 85, 89; names of attendants, 35 n.; receives letter from Elizabeth, 36; writes Elizabeth and Cecil, 36; her mode of life, 39; her priest, her services of silver, 39; visit of Nicholas White, 40; heard the English service, 41; her ill English, 41; wrought with her needle, 42; personal appearance, 43; her opinion of Cecil, 43; her illness and trouble, 46; stormy letter to Elizabeth, 48; asks permission to send to Edinburgh, 48; threatens to seek foreign aid; her health, 49; writes to La Mothe, 39 n., 49, 60, 79, 123, 138, 219, 260; removal to Wingfield, 51; her apartments, 53; increased freedom of intercourse; treasonable correspondence, 55; sends Ross to London, 57; grief at news brought by Sandy Bog, 58; sends Sandy to London; Bishop of Ross's report, 59; Countess of Shrewsbury to keep her company, 60; illness, 61; letters to Bishop of Ross, 61, 138, 160, 163, 164, 165, 166, 226; recovery, 62; letters to Duke of Norfolk, 62, 63, 80, 119, 123; projected marriage, 63; physicians see her, 65; change of her lodgings, 65; removed to Chatsworth, and return to Wingfield, 66; suggested removal to Belvoir, 69; her health, 73; desire to leave Wing-

field, 73; writes "to my lords of the nobility," 76; hopeful, but suspicious, 79; her escape deemed unimportant, 81; marriage project with Norfolk exploded, 81; returns to Tutbury, 83; stringent restraint, 84; letters and messages stopped, 85; objections to Huntingdon, 86; condition miserable, 89; coffers searched; incident of the pistolets, 90; kept from intelligence, 91; writes to Walsingham, 93; King of France remonstrates for her, 95; complains to Elizabeth and Cecil, 95; better treated; Sandy Bog brings letters, 96; sickness returns, 97; removed to Coventry, 100; her sojourn at an Inn disapproved, 101; removed to private house, 102; would fain go to Windsor, 105; complains to Cecil, 106; taken back to Tutbury, 107; presents hawks to Shrewsbury, 110; affection for Norfolk, 111; her secret correspondence, 112; complains of a preacher, 112; writes to the Archbishop of Glasgow, Cecil and Elizabeth, 113; plots for escape, 115; falls sick of a fever, 116; stimulates Norfolk; practices with her long bow, 117; renewed negotiations, 118; hesitates about terms, 119; removed to Chatsworth, 121; negotiations and instructions, 123; writes to Countess of Lennox, 124; renewed restraint, 125; receives M. de Poigny, 126; eager for the treaty; letters by Poigny, 127; asked to confirm treaty of Edinburgh, to disavow pretence of marriage with Anjou, 128; plots for her liberation, 131; negotiates with Cecil and Mildmay, agreeing to Elizabeth's proposals, 134; suggested marriage with Angus, 135; to take the air on horseback, 136; intended removal to Sheffield, 138; leaves Chatsworth, 140; reaches Sheffield, 142; sickness "no thing slacket;" physicians sent to, 158; their report, 159; anxious to proceed with treaty; instructions to Ross, Galloway, and Livingstone, 160; "partly convalescit;" desires the treaty, 161; illness caused by severe storm; sends letters by the physicians, 163; marriage project with Norfolk revived, 164; asks for wine, cinnamon water, drugs and virginals; asks passport for Archbishop of Glasgow; pressed for furtherance of treaty, 166; writes to Sussex, Leicester, and Cecil, 166-7; urges invasion of Scotland, 167; her title to the English succession, 168; instructs Ridolfi, Alva, and the King of Spain; hopes centre in Spain, 170; accredits Ridolfi, 171; writes to Lord Burghley, 172; solicits "honest treatment," 173; professed intentions towards Elizabeth, 174; contrivances for escape, 179; loss of Dumbarton, 182; remonstrates against new regulations, 183; asks to go to Buxton, 184; names of her household, 185; kindness to George Douglas, 191; replies to Burghley, 195; intriguing with foreigners, 196; sickness, 197; sends John Gordon to Paris, 203; dismissal of servants; remonstrates with Elizabeth, 207; letter to banished servants, 209; writes to Elizabeth from her "close prison of Sheffield, 218; takes the air on the leads, 219; begs for a priest, 219; linen may not be overhauled by men, 221; removal suggested, 223; complains of George Buchanan's "Detection," 224; urges her friends to invade England, 227; names of soldiers, 236; interview with Sir Ralph Sadler, 239; protestations of innocence, 240; walks in the court-yard, 241; hears of Norfolk's condemnation, 245; her grief, 246; steps over her shoes in the snow; receives Elizabeth's memoir of complaints, 250; writes to the Duke of Alva, and to Grange and Lethington, 252; stormy and threatening, 253; unquiet and melancholy, 255; discontent at hearing of a Parliament, 256; unquiet and sickly; sends a present to Elizabeth, 258; Parliament resolves to attaint her, and Convocation asks for her execution, 259; her remarks on this, 260; her grief for Norfolk's death, 261; commissioners treat with her, 262; her answers, 263; De Jos brings her money, 266; French Ambassador solicits better treatment, 267; increased restraint, 271; permitted to walk near the Castle, 275; secret negotiations for her surrender to the Scots, 278; her grief and melancholy, 280; her position at the end of 1572, 283; her complaints to Shrewsbury, 286; her dowry plundered; plots for her deliverance, 287; receives holland and money from La Mothe; removed to Sheffield Manor, 289; the capture of Edinburgh Castle nips her sore, 294; her dowry from France, 295; replies

to suggestions to defray her own charges, 296, 359; French proceedings about the dowry; negotiates with Du Verger and Vassal, 297; restraints relaxed; desires to visit Buxton, 298; goes to Chatsworth, 299; permission to go to Buxton, 300; new alarms, 301; is removed to Buxton, 302; letter writing and recreations, 304; complains of Shrewsbury's strictness, 305; returns to Sheffield, 306; plot for her escape, 307; fair professions, 308; troubled about her dowry, 317; materials for embroidery, 318; La Mothe's entreaties, 320; seeks aid of Christian princes, fears poison, 325, 332; prayers in the vulgar tongue, 326; reads Picard's sermons, 327; removed to Sheffield Lodge, 328; presents embroidery to Elizabeth, 329; also sweetmeats; sends presents to Leicester, 330; asks La Mothe for lace; mode of writing letters, 331; asks passport for Rallay, 332; removed to Buxton, 333; discomposed by Hamilton's arrest; orders pension for Cockyn, 337; prison amusements, 339; describes the factions in England, 340; Leicester's intention to speak of marriage, 342; describes Rollett's illness and death, 343; his coffers searched; removed to Sheffield Lodge, 344; writes about her dowry, and asks for little dogs, 345; La Mothe thinks her life in danger, 348; presents to Elizabeth, 349, 357; seeks French help; orders portraits, 352; urged to grant the kingly title to her son; secret messengers arrested, 354; earthquake, 356; kindness to her servants, 357; Nau becomes Secretary; correspondence intercepted and liberty restrained, 358; desires help from Spain, 360; indisposition, 362; writes to the Duc de Nevers, to Dr. Allen, 363, 389, 580; allowance for her maintenance, 364; her health, 369; her boxes opened by Walsingham; curious watch, 370; is asked to procure dogs for the King of France, 371; fears action of Parliament, 372; removed to Sheffield Lodge; visited by Dolu, 374; anticipating interview with Elizabeth, 376; visits Buxton, and returns to Sheffield, 377; writes to Duc de Nevers about her dowry, 378; promotes marriage between Andrew Beaton and Mary Seaton, 378; removed from Sheffield Castle to Sheffield Lodge, 379; liberty abridged; makes a will at Sheffield Lodge, 380; sits for portrait, 393; resolves to dismiss Dolu, her Treasurer, 397; rumours of her escape, 399; leaves Chatsworth for Sheffield; desires to get her son into France, 400; stimulates the Pope, 401; relations with the Countess of Lennox, 406; foreign intrigues, 408; complains of hard treatment and want of exercise; letters intercepted, 409; visited by Du Verger; removed to Chatsworth, 410; declines to renounce her claims to the English succession, 411; annoyed by her cook, 412; removed from Chatsworth to Sheffield Lodge; pious resignation, 413; fair professions to Elizabeth, 413-14; professions and performances contrasted, 418; permission to send Nau into Scotland, 420; removed to Chatsworth; a dry cough, 421; inventory of things sent to, 422 n.; tries to stimulate Spain, 423; returns to Sheffield Lodge, and writes to Walsingham, Elizabeth, and Burghley, 424; opposed to the Elizabeth-Alençon marriage, 425; good hopes of her affairs, 426; dealings with England, France, and Spain, 427; her representations to Guise, appeal to the King of Spain, 428; ready for any contingency, 432; suggestions for the King of France, 433; dealings with Spain disclosed, 434; supplicates Elizabeth, 435; hopes to gain Burghley, 436; appeals for greater liberty, and permission to visit Buxton, 437; anxiety for freedom, 438; active in her correspondence, 440; god-mother to Gilbert Talbot's child, 445; accident in mounting her horse; removed to Buxton; strict seclusion, 446; gives beggar woman a smock; relieved by the Baths; "the new sickness," 447; returns to Sheffield "well and hearty," 448; sends gelding to the Duke of Guise, 449; dowry mismanaged and plundered; meditations on adversity, 450; satisfaction at Morton's arrest, 453; proposes "association" with her son, 454; appoints Duke of Guise her agent, 455; how her dowry was spent, 457; her diet complained of, 459; asserts to Elizabeth the purity of her intentions, 460; negotiations with Spain, 461; far reaching plot, 462; secret correspondence, 464; anxious for liberty; removed to Chatsworth;

wishful to commute her dowry to fixed income, 465; zeal for the re-establishment of Catholicism, 466; protests against France recognizing her son as King; adhesion to the Spanish alliance; appeals to Elizabeth, 467; negotiates with Robert Beale, 469; complaints, 471; her sickness, 475; complains that her coach is not sent, 476; receives Beale in darkened room, 477; desires medical assistance, 481; considerably better, 482; her opinion of her son, 485; requests greater liberty, 487; negotiations in abeyance; her coach sent to Sheffield, and liberty extended, 488; has not stirred abroad; liberty of exercise in Sheffield Park, 491; fears she is not sincerely dealt with, 493; pushes the Jesuit plot and the designs to get help from Spain, 494; seeks to stand well with England, France, and Spain; Spain her chief hope, 495; motives in proposing "the association," 497; asked by Lennox to recognize her son, reply to the proposals for invasion, 500; instructions to Mendoza, 501; doubts the prudence of the Jesuit missionaries, 502; wishes Archbishop of Glasgow and Nau to meet in Scotland, 503; visited by de Ruisseau, 509; forwards her intrigues with Spain; speaks of design of Shrewsbury's, 510; illness; restrained from the liberty of the park, 511; writes long and carefully prepared letter to Elizabeth, 512; asks Mauvissière to read it; says her health gets worse, 514; uncertainty and perplexity of her cause, 516; again proposes the association, and draws up letters patent, 517; negotiations in English with Beale, 521; enumerates her requirements, 523; negotiates with Mildmay, 527; suspects insincerity of Elizabeth, 528; her opinion of Walsingham; removed to Worksop, 529; said to consent to recognize her son's title, 534; suspicions of Archibald Douglas, 535; visits Worksop again; writes to Bess Pierrepoint, 536; her treatment at Worksop, 537; scandalous tales of Lady Shrewsbury, 547; protests her sincerity in seeking the treaty, 548; letter about the scandals, 549; her receipt for secret writing, 550; accusations against Lady Shrewsbury, 551; her letter of scandal to Elizabeth, 552; denials of, yet complicity in, Throckmorton's conspiracy, 560; addresses a long letter to Mauvissière about the negotiations, 561; protests her ignorance of Somerville and Arden, 562; knows who is both the luller and the lulled, 564; failure of the treaty should not be laid to her, 565; proposed removal to Melbourne, 566; treats with Maron and Waad, 568; bitter words and complaints, 569; sixteen years in prison; grown old; state of her body, 571; "a chopping stone," 572; talks on religious toleration, 574; scarce three honest men in Scotland, 575; jealous of her right to the English succession; final message to Elizabeth by Waad, 576; negotiates with Beale; indisposition, 578; how easily she might be set at liberty, 580; removed to Buxton, 582; writes to Mauvissière of her improved health; begs Elizabeth to make an end of the treaty, 583; her farewell to Buxton, 584; interview with Sadler; fair professions towards Elizabeth, 589; finally leaves Sheffield, 591; talk with Mr. Somer on the way to Wingfield, 592; disclaims any desire to escape, 596; arrives at Wingfield, 597; takes leave of Shrewsbury, 598; desires to send Nau to London, 603; departs from Wingfield, 616; spends night at Derby, 617; arrives at Tutbury and writes to Burghley, 618.

Marye Angel, perfumer, 35 n., 186 n.

Mass books found in Shrewsbury's ship, 518.

Mass-mongers and conjurors, 284.

Mauvissière, Madame de, 432.

Mauvissière, Michel de Castelnau de, fears mischief to the Queen of Scots, 402; deprecates suspicions and jealousies, 410-11; desires Mary's better treatment, 412; says Queen of Scots is more content and at ease, 420; instructed to do all he can for Mary, but act prudently, 423; letter to King of France, 457 n.; describes Elizabeth's popularity, 546; *mentioned*, 50, 368, 371, 376, 427, 431, 435, 436, 448, 459.

Measles at Sheffield, 328.

Medard, Pearse, 35 n.

Medical assistance for Queen of Scots, 65, 158, 481, 491, 504.

Medici, Catherine de, 440, 441.

Melbourne, proposed removal of Mary Stuart to, 566.

Melino, Richard, envoy of the Duke of Guise, 533, 539.

Melville, Sir Robert, envoy from Murray to the Queen of Scots, 27, 28.
Mendoza, Don Bernardino de, Spanish ambassador in London, and afterwards in Paris, 434, 454, 464, 495; communications with Jesuit plotters, 496; says Elizabeth is persecuting the Duke of Lennox, 514; perceives the life of Mary involves the death of Elizabeth, and *vice versa*, 530; ordered to quit England; Teulet's note on, 544.
Middlemore, gentleman of Elizabeth's chamber, 432.
Midwife and nurse, fees of, 491.
Mignet, "Histoire de Marie Stuart," *quoted*, 462, 545.
Mildmay, Sir Walter, accompanies Cecil to Chatsworth, 132; returns to London, 134; sent to Sheffield, 526; note on, 526 n.; found Mary decayed in health, 527; ordered home; receives great courtesy from Shrewsbury, 528; talks with Mary, 529; accompanies Mary and Shrewsbury to Worksop, 529.
Moorhall, 32 n.
Moreton, William, soldier, 236.
Moretown, Sir John, a priest, 39.
Morgan, Thomas, 250, 334.
Morphy, Edward, 148.
Morton, Earl of, notes projects for Mary's escape, 179; succeeds Marr as Regent, 280; sends cautions, 335; arrest of, 453; beheaded, 454; *mentioned*, 400, 408, 410, 422, 424, 426, 434, 439, 485.
Morton, Mr., 2, 9.
Mothe, M. de la (see La Mothe).
Murdin's "State Papers," *quoted*, 307.
Murray, the Earl of, sends apparel for Queen of Scots, 4n.; sends Melville to, 27; assassinated, 113; *mentioned*, 9, 10, 28, 63, 128.
Musgrave, Simon, 25.
Mutton, price of, 612.

Nau, Secretary to the Queen of Scots, 356 n., 358, 370, 376; scheming for his brother, 397; letters to his brother, 398n., 401; returns discomfited from Scotland, 420, 421; promises good offices between the two Queens, 470; memorial of requests, 487; design to meet the Archbishop of Glasgow in Scotland, 494; perceives heart-burnings between the two Queens, 512; enumerates his mistress's requirements, 523; conversation with Beale, 524; gives Mildmay a memorandum on the dowry, 529; welcomes Maron and treats with Waad, 568; desires conversation with Waad, 573, 577; negotiates in London, 614; returns to Wingfield, 616; *mentioned*, 422, 438, 474, 479, 480, 481, 485.
Negotiations, between Elizabeth and Mary, 75, 118, 132, 160, 161, 262, 469, 488, 492, 521, 527; renewed, 568; going on, 609.
Nemours, the Duchess of, 354.
Nevell, or Nyvell Hew, 221.
Nevers, the Duc de, 363, 378.
Neville, Sir Henry, charged with Shrewsbury to remove Queen of Scots, 404; discharged, 405; joined with Sadler to remove Mary to Melbourne, 566; arrangement not carried out, 568.
Norfolk, the Duke of, 3, 10; projected marriage with the Queen of Scots, 27, 55, 56, 61, 62, 63; marriage project revived, 75; indifferent to Mary's escape, 81; scolded by Elizabeth, 81; marriage project exploded, 81; fled from Court, 86; message to Northumberland, 87; sent to the Tower, 88; marriage project revived, 111; assurances to Elizabeth, 122; released from Tower, 130; marriage again contemplated, 164; instructs Ridolfi, 171; secret interview with Ridolfi, 172; ciphered letter, addressed "30," 175; renewed arrest, 203; makes lamentable submission, 212; tried for high treason, 231; condemned, 233; parliament and convocation ask for his execution, 259; executed, 259; *mentioned*, 75, 94, 98, 135.
Northampton, the battle of, 52.
Northern rebellion, supposed to have blown over, 88; breaks out, 98; dash on Tutbury contemplated, 98; collapse of, 106, 263.
Northumberland, Earl of, claims custody of Queen of Scots, 1; his wrath, 2; requested by Norfolk to postpone insurrection, 88; raises his standard, 98; visited Wentworth before the rebellion, 204; beheaded at York, 269; *mentioned*, 120, 128.
Northumberland, the old Countess of, 203, 263.
Norton, the Manor of, part of Babington estate, 190 n.
Norton, Richard, 25.
Nottingham Castle, suggested as prison for Mary, 101, 102, 105.

Numbers guarding the Queen of Scots, 609.
Nurse and midwife, fees of, 491.
Nycolson, a porter, 252.

Oats, price of, 612.
Ochiltree, Lord, 453.
Ogilvy, Lord, 440.
Opposing interests of England, France, and Spain, 494.
Ox, price of, 612.

Paget, Charles, a Catholic conspirator, 540; flies to France, 542.
Parkers, soldiers, 236.
Parliament, the English, 168, 256, 259, 260, 372.
Palmer, a conjuring scholar, 284.
Parsons, a Jesuit missionary, 439, 496.
Peas, price of, 612.
Pegge's MSS., College of Arms, 190 n.
Pembroke, the Earl of, *mentioned*, 17, 75, 81, 88, 90.
People, burdens on, 107.
Percy, Sir Henry, plots to rescue Queen of Scots, 180.
Pestilence, in Rotherham and Fulgeam's next land, 120.
Philip II., King of Spain, 39, 186, 188, 360, 362; advised to retaliate on Elizabeth, 404; estimate of Elizabeth's sincerity in her marriage negotiations, 411, 417; urged to send envoy to Scotland, 416; stimulated by Mary, 423; not to be carried beyond prudence, 430, 441; approves Morton's arrest, 454; instructions to Mendoza, 495; desires information about proposed invasion, 501; opinion of seizure of James and disgrace of Lennox, 514; sends 10,000 crowns to help the conspirators, 514; urges the Pope to find money, 533; his note on the margin of a despatch, 534; instructions to Charles Paget, 540; *mentioned*, 434, 439, 461, 464, 466.
Physicians sent to Wingfield, 65; sent to Sheffield, 158; return to London, 163; letter from, 228 n.; Mary expecting one, 421; letter of, describing Mary's symptoms, 437 n.; desired by Mary, 481; have leave to attend, 491; sent down, 504.
Picard's sermons, 327.
Pierrepoint, Bess, letter from Mary Stuart to, 536.
Pistolets, carried by Shrewsbury's men, 90.
Poigny, M. de, envoy from Charles IX., 126, 127.
Poison, feared by Queen of Scots, 325, 332.
Poisy, a milliner, 340.
Political ecclesiastics, 502.
Pontefract, Queen of Scots at, 26, 28.
Portraits of the Queen of Scots, 352; the "Sheffield portrait," 393; George Scharf's opinion, 394; Dr. Chalmer's and Mr. Pailou's opinions, 395.
Posts, between Wingfield and Nottingham, Sheffield and Doncaster, 590.
Poulet, Sir Amias, appointed keeper of the Queen of Scots, 616; refuses to put Queen of Scots to death without warrant, 620; "Letter Books," edited by Father Morris, 619.
Powell, a pensioner, 180.
Pox-small, Elizabeth suffers from, 276.
Presents from the Queen of Scots to Elizabeth, 258, 328, 329, 330, 349, 357, 359, 372; to Leicester, 330; from Shrewsbury to the Lord Treasurer and others, 418; of hawks to Shrewsbury, 110.
Priest for Queen of Scots, John Moretown, 39; begs for, 219; desired for Queen of Scots, 515.
Privy Council, anxious for settlement of the succession, 75; vote in favour of settlement, 80; Shrewsbury takes his seat at, 600.
Puyguillem, servant of Queen of Scots, 328.

Quarrels in the Shrewsbury family, 293, 367, 390, 538, 551, 586-89.

Rallay, Madlle., 318, 332, 350.
Raw, a servant of Lord Lumley's, 180.
Reade, Mr., 2; his band of soldiers, 7, 9, 21 n.
Reader's History of Coventry, *quoted*, 100.
Rede, Cuthbert, a servant of Ross and carrier of letters, *mentioned*, 166, 241, 243, 252, 334.
Religion in Scotland, prospects of, 499.
Religious toleration, conversation on, 574.
Reull, or Revell, John, 204, 284.
Revell, Grange, 284 n.
Reynold's mortar mill, Trippet lane, *mentioned*, 146 n.
Richmondshire, no sermons in, 23.

Ridolfi, Robert, consulted by Cecil; chosen as agent by Queen of Scots and Duke of Norfolk, 169; receives instructions, 171; secret interview with Norfolk, 172; Burghley's letter concerning, 192; at Madrid, 197; letter intercepted, 216, 263.
Ripon, 25, 27; Queen of Scots sleeps at, 28, 36, 63; rebels at, 98.
Roads, state of, between Wingfield and Tutbury, 617.
Robinson, George, servant of the Bishop of Ross, 126 n.; imprisoned at Sheffield, 208.
Rogers, Henry, soldier, 236.
Rolleston, Francis, of Lea, 198, 204; family of, 199.
Rollett, Raullett, or Rolat, Peter, secretary to Queen of Scots, 35 n., 36 n., 141, 167 n., 185 n., 200, 201; illness of, 318, 331, 339, 342; his death, 343; his coffers searched, 344; buried at Sheffield, 344; *mentioned*, 356 n.
Rollston, 60 n.
Rolson (who betrayed his father), 325.
Rolston, a gentleman pensioner, 132.
Ronksley, George, soldier, 236.
Ross, Bishop of (see Leslie).
Rotherham, 26; history of, 29; Queen of Scots at, 30; pestilence in, 120; College, 26, 29; Thomas, de, Archbishop of York, 26, 29; Thomas Corker, vicar of, 321.
Rowlandson, Ralph, 25.
Royde, Giles le, 35 n., 186 n.
Rufford Abbey, 15, 345, 392.
Ruisseau, M. de, visits Sheffield, 509; detained in custody, 511; permitted to return to London, 512.
Ruthven, Lord, 486.
Ruthven, the raid of, 505, 512.
Rutland, the Earl of, 13; meets Shrewsbury at Worksop, 538; his name in the Catholic lists, 539.
Ryse, a Thames waterman, 252.

Sadler Papers, with historical notes by Walter Scott, ed. 1809, *quoted*, 100, 239, 249, 597, 598, 599, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 609, 612, 618.
Sadler, Sir Ralph, helps to put down Northern rebellion, 100; arrives in Sheffield, 234; graphic letters, 235; describes Shrewsbury's precautions, 236; interview with Queen of Scots, 239; dispute about an opened letter, 242; excuses a blotted letter, 243; hopes for justice against Mary and Norfolk, 247; anxious to leave Sheffield, 248; appointed a commissioner, 262; instructed to take charge of Queen of Scots, 566; plan changed, 568; appointed with Mr. Somer to relieve Shrewsbury, 584; arrives at Sheffield; delays removal to Wingfield, 585; interview with Queen of Scots, 589; complains of the posts, 590; reports arrival of Queen of Scots at Wingfield, 597; reports proceedings of Queen of Scots; tenderness of her body, 603; describes arrangement and precautions at Wingfield, 604; searching out treacheries among Shrewsbury's servants, 605; commends Salter, the gentleman porter, 606; urges William Hawkesworth, late yeoman porter, to go to Court, 607; answers questions about Queen of Scots, 609; appointed Shrewsbury's successor, 613.
Salter, Mr., gentleman porter in succession to Bentall, 605; his vigilance, 606.
Sandy, the master cook's boy, 186 n.
Sanlie, Jaquece de, 185 n.
Savile, Sir George, Shrewsbury's son-in-law, 519.
Scandal letter, Queen Mary's, 553; question of authenticity, 552; its date, 557.
Scandalous reports, spread by Lady Shrewsbury, 547, 549.
Scharf, George, keeper of the national portrait gallery, *quoted*, 394, 395.
Scots, Elizabeth's disgraceful proposal to the, 278.
Scrope, Lady, sister of Duke of Norfolk, 3.
Scrope, Lord, appointed to attend Mary, 3; writes to Elizabeth, 4; wishes to move to Bolton, 8; a late watcher at Carlisle, 9; *mentioned*, 20 n., 22, 26, 37, 126 n., 254.
Seaton, Lady, 357.
Seaton, Lord, 167, 252, 335, 433; negotiating in France, 581.
Seaton, Mary, 6, 25 n., 31, 36 n., 45, 141, 185 n., 370; engaged to marry Andrew Beaton, 378, 479.
Secret writing, receipt for, 550.
Seigneur, Guillaume le, pantler, 186 n.
Semar, 60 n.
Semple, John, 184.
Servants of the Queen of Scots, 5; number reduced, 34, 85, 89; names of, 35 n., 185 n.; dismissed, 207; Queen of Scots writes to those "banished," 209; kindness to, 357; number of, 610; diet of, 611.
Seuller, Jacques, tailor, 35 n.
Shea or Sheaf bridge, 147.

Sheffield, 20 n., 21 n., 25, 28, 30, 31; removal of Mary to sanctioned, 74; the project abandoned, 82; Town Trustees accounts quoted, 100; Elizabeth, Countess of Lennox, buried at, 490.
Sheffield Castle, 15; Queen of Scots removed to; described, 143; antiquity of, 145; drain through Castle hill; underground passage, 146 n.; measles at, 328; earthquake at, 355; Mary returns from Chatsworth to, 400; removed from, 437; returns to, 448; Robert Beale arrives at, 469.
Sheffield Lodge, or Sheffield Manor, 15; first seen by Queen of Scots, 142; described; date of erection, 149, 150; inventory of furniture 1582, 151; small lodge still standing, 152; restored 1872, 153; extensive view from, 157, 268, 271; Mary removed to, 328, 344, 374, 379, 413, 424, 437; Mary finally leaves, 591; *mentioned*, 144, 146, 440, 459.
Sheffield Park, 15; its extent, 146, 489; large timber, 147; stand-house in, 264 n.; Mary has liberty of, 491.
Sheffield, the Bailiff of, 451.
Sherwood forest, Mary not permitted to walk in, 537.
Ship, Shrewsbury's, mass books found in, 518; proposal to send her out with Mr. Hawkins, 518.
Shory, Thomas, 186 n.
Shrewsbury, Francis, fifth Earl of, 13,
Shrewsbury, George, the fourth Earl of, 52, 149.
Shrewsbury, George, the 6th Earl of, 13; his portrait, 14; his possessions, 15; proposes marriage to Elizabeth Hardwick, 17; the marriage, 18; receives Queen of Scots, 19; "Remembrances" for, 20, 21 n., 22 n.; not a Catholic, 23 n.; letter from Queen Elizabeth, 31 n.; writes to Cecil, 33; asks for £500, 34; his allowance; discharges superfluous Scots and Frenchmen, 35; desires for Queen of Scots out-door recreations, 40; explains White's talk with Queen of Scots; daily resort of Mary to Countess's chamber, 45; never absent from his charge, 46, 47 n.; writes to Cecil, 46; begins to weary, 47; replies to Elizabeth's enquiries, 49; receives authority to move to Wingfield, 51; moves there; complains of the number of Scots resorting thither, 56; describes Mary's illness, 61; writes to Cecil, 64; visits Chatsworth, 66; seized with an ague, 67; also eased of his painful feet, 68; serious relapse, 69; escapes danger, 70; goes to Buxton without leave, 71; Wingfield unsavory; suggests removal to Sheffield, 73; gout troubling him, 74; writes to Cecil, 81; begs him to procure his release, 82; mislikes removing to Sheffield, and returns to Tutbury, 83; Huntingdon ordered to supersede, 84; joint Commission with Huntingdon and Hereford, 85; ordered to search Mary's coffers; remonstrates against his supercession; thanks Elizabeth, 86; begs to be saved from discredit; receives soothing letter from Elizabeth, 87; instructed to question Mary; incident of pistolets, 90; his treatment of Huntingdon complained of, 91; defends himself, 92; defends his wife against suspicions, 93; suggestion about Mary's letters, 96; thinks Mary somewhat afraid of her life, 97; hearing of Northern rebellion adds 100 men to his guard, 98; alarm, 99; removed to Coventry, 100; suggests Nottingham, 101; writes Cecil, 102; returns to Tutbury; burdens on common people, 107; scarcity of fuel; allowance of wine, 108; accepts present of hawks, 110; Lent sermons before Queen of Scots, 114; lock on Mary's outer chamber taken off, 115; removal to Chatsworth, 121; admonished, 124; deliberates to transport Mary to Sheffield, 139; coat of arms at Sheffield Lodge; sends plan of a Lodge to Burghley, 156; reduces number of Queen of Scots' attendants, 165; asks to be informed of practices, 179; handwriting, 182; new regulations, 183; list of Mary's servants, 185; death of his neighbour, Babington, 188; Anthony Babington becomes his ward, 189; informs Mary of discovery of her practices, 192; her sickness, 197; remarks on Elizabeth's marriage negotiation, 198; dismisses superfluous servants, 207; suspicions against his wife, 214; urged to vigilance, 217; said to be wholly addicted to the Scottish Queen, 221; writes to Burghley, 225, 227; leaves for London, 231; presides at Norfolk's trial, 232; his precautions at Sheffield, 236; returns to Sheffield, 249; delivers Elizabeth's memoir of complaints, 250; traces out secret messengers, 251; looks for lad with letters; his charge

stormy and unquiet, 253; writes to Bateman, 254; letters to Burghley about devices, 255; Mary unquiet and melancholy, 255, 258, 280; reads to Mary the request of Convocation, 260; a Commissioner with others to treat with Mary, 262; entertains M. Dardoye, 264; the visit of de Jos, 266; removal to Sheffield Lodge, 268; appointed Earl Marshal; strictness of precautions, 274; has her "in sure keeping," 275; desires news from Court, 276; evil reports about, 281; his explanations, 282; searches out conjurors and mass-mongers, 284; diligence well accepted by the Council; conversation with the Queen of Scots, 285; will have her forthcoming either quick or dead, 288; doating letters to his wife, 292; reports how Mary bears loss of Edinburgh Castle, 294; his allowance, 295; evades responsibility, 299; troubled a little with pain, 306; fidelity doubted, 307; careful of his charge; a cough, 308; half remonstrates against indulgences to the captive, 320; charged by Cocker and Howarth with favouring the title of the Queen of Scots, 321; anxiety to be relieved of his cumbersome charge, 322; writes indignantly, 323; efforts to get the Queen of Scots from his care, 324; silks for his wife, 327; cautions about measles, 329; searches Rollett's coffers, 344; excuses the marriage of Elizabeth Cavendish and Charles, Earl of Lennox, 347; complains of suspicions 350; writes of Gilbert's wife confined; he christened the child, 355; renewed vigilance, 358; allowance reduced, 364; thanked for entertainment of Leicester, 385; replies to the Queen, 387; sends Burghley platte of a Lodge, 388; estrangement from his wife, 390; visits Worksop and Rufford, 392; grief at death of grandson, 393 n.; letters to Burghley and Walsingham, 393 n.; cautioned by Walsingham, 399; by Elizabeth, 400 n.; directed with Sir H. Nevill to remove Queen of Scots to Ashby, 404; order countermanded, 405; protests his fidelity, 405 n.; seeks favour for Arabella Stuart, 407; absents himself for three days, and is reprimanded, 421; need of care, 438; lease of land near Sheffield Castle, 441; complains to Burghley; non-payment of the diet money, 442; his cark and care, and heavy charges, 443; desires to remove to Chatsworth and Buxton, 445; moves to Buxton, 446; how a poor woman got a smock, 447; complains about the diet money, 450; orders scarlet cloth; writes to Leicester about his allowance, 451; admonishes Martin and Knite, 452; angry at withholding of diet money, 455; writes to Elizabeth, 455 n; advised to make suit for land in fee farm, 458; acts on the advice, 490; asks price of old plate; said to be buying estates, 458; charged with diminishing the service of Queen of Scots, 459; hospitably receives Robert Beale, 469; tells Beale his wrongs; diet money reduced, and heavy charges, 472; troubled with the gout, 474; instructed to draw specific offers from Mary; Mary's illness, 481; desires to visit Court; protests against rebatement of his allowance, 487, 490, 504; writes Walsingham, 488 n.; reports Mary had not stirred abroad, 489; payment to nurse and midwife of his daughter-in-law, 491; is most quiet with fewest women; complains of spies, 491; obtains leave to repair to Court, 505; proposes Francis Wortley as his substitute at Sheffield; instructions to Baldwin, 506; his letter about Wortley, 507 n.; journey to Court postponed, 508; melancholy letter to Walsingham, 509 n.; said to entertain a design for the Queen of Scots' escape, 510; his objection to a priest, 515; disturbed by the discovery of mass books; projected voyage for his ship, 518; orders stool coverings and a silk jerkin; joined with Beale in commission to receive "certain matters," from Queen of Scots, 519; attends a cock-fight, 524; entertains Mildmay, 528; removes his charge to Worksop, 529; letter from Beale about the treaty, 531 n.; denies that Mary walked in Sherwood forest, 537; meets Earl of Rutland at Worksop; his talk with Gilbert Talbot, 538; indignation at scandalous reports spread by his wife, 547; projected visit to Court, 561; declares Elizabeth's answer to Queen of Scots, 564; ready with 200,000 more to hazard his life for Elizabeth, 565; draft order for his release, 567; receives Waad and Maron, 568; sits during the negotiations because of the gout, 573; en-

treaty to be relieved; goes to Buxton, 582; receives permission to repair to Court, 584; annoyed by "contrarieties," 586; writes Leicester about family quarrels, 587; also to Burghley, 588; resolves to remove Queen of Scots to Wingfield, 590; takes leave of Queen of Scots, 598; journey to London; reception at Court, 599; "memorable testimonial" from the Privy Council, 600; supposed treacheries among his servants, 605; intent to punish his defamers, 609; formally released from his charge, 613.
Shrewsbury, Gilbert, seventh Earl (see Talbot, Gilbert).
Shrewsbury, John, first Earl, 13, 14.
Shrewsbury, John, second Earl, 51.
Shrewsbury, John, third Earl, 52.
Shrewsbury, the Countess of, 15, 16; peers descended from, 16 n.; Lodge's opinion of, 17; described; Hunter's opinion, 18; takes hangings to Tutbury, 31; proceeds to Wingfield, 56; keeps company with Queen of Scots, 60; takes charge during the Earl's illness, 67; writes to Cecil; combats suspicions and malice of her enemies, 68; renewed suspicions, 93; dealings with Hersey Lassells, 214; replies from Chatsworth, 215; walks with the Queen of Scots, 241; incurs suspicion because of the Lennox-Cavendish marriage, 347; her family interest, 365, 366; writes to her husband; "his charge and love," 382; estrangement from her husband, 390; death of her grandson, George Talbot, 392; anxiety for interest of Arabella Stuart, 407; conciliated by Mary, 411; enquires after Mary's health, 479; had known her worse and yet recover, 480; spreads scandals concerning her husband and Mary Stuart, 547; ambitious projects for Arabella, 551; quarrel with her husband, 587.
Shrewsbury vault at Sheffield, 14 n.
Sickness, the new, 447.
Simier, representative of the Duke of Alençon, 419, 425.
Simpson, James, horse keeper, 186 n.
Singleton, an agent for Mary's secret correspondence, 449, 464.
Sittwell, Mr., 148.
Skargelle, George, servant to Shrewsbury, 421.
Skinner, a priest and conjurer, 284.
Skipwith, a Queen's messenger, 82, 102.
Smith, Sir Thomas, concludes treaty with France, 259; note on, 285 n.; his successor, 455.
Smythe, Dr., a physician sent to the Queen of Scots, 504.
Smylter, Roger, soldier, 236.
Soldiers, guarding the Queen of Scots, 236; wages, rate of, 610.
Somer, John, son-in-law and colleague of Sadler in charge of the Queen of Scots, 584; interview with Mary, 589; grows into acquaintance with William Hawksworth, 606; reports on Tutbury, 614.
Somerville, John, a Catholic conspirator, 541; discloses plot against Elizabeth, 542; found strangled in Newgate, 543; Mary Stuart professes ignorance of, 562.
Spain, dealings with, 360; Spanish opinion, 361; representations to King of, 410; secret dealings, 430; France and Spain intrigue for ascendancy, 431; great Spanish plot, 462; Mary pushes her negotiations with, 510.
Sparrow, William, soldier, 236.
Spetelle, Janette, 186 n.
Spies, about Shrewsbury, 281, 491, 504 n., 510.
St. Andrews, the Archbishop of, Queen of Scots writes to, 30.
St. John, Lord, proposed as keeper of Queen of Scots, 613; declines, 616.
St. Loe, Sir William, 17.
Stable, Queen Mary's, 35 n., 40, 618.
Stacye, Rev. J., *quoted* 152.
Staniforth, Sam, gamekeeper, 148.
Stanley, Sir Thomas, 180.
State Trials, by Francis Hargrave, edition 1776, *quoted* 63, 234.
Stewart, James, son of Lord Ochiltree, 453.
Strickland, Agnes, "Letters of Mary Queen of Scots," edition 1843, *quoted*, 24, 44, 48, 49, 58, 59, 60, 62, 64, 81, 95, 96, 111, 112, 117, 127, 137, 160, 191, 234, 247, 248, 260, 261, 330, 332, 371, 372, 383, 406, 407, 446, 459, 513, 546, 551, 561, 566.
Stringer, Mr., Shrewsbury's steward, note on, 606 n.
Stuart, Arabella, born, 366; her father dies, 378; her claims, 407, 411; sends sample of handwriting and message to Elizabeth, 528; her grandmother's plans for, 551; mentioned in the scandal letter, 557.
Stuart, Esmé, Lord D'Aubigny, and afterwards Earl and Duke of Lennox, 407, 412 n., 426; arrives in Scotland, 424; dates of his honours, 453 n; in

high favour with James, 497; demands on the foreign powers, 498; expresses readiness to lose his life or deliver Mary Stuart, 499; flies to France, 505; dies in Paris, 532; *mentioned*, 434, 439, 440, 467, 483.
Stuart, Lord Robert, 381.
Succession, the English, 86, 168, 373, 411.
Sussex, the Earl of, 10; advises Queen of Scots should be detained, 11; afraid to leave York because of rebellion, 100; *mentioned*, 26, 27, 28, 120.
Sutton, Francis, of Revell Grange, 284 n.
Sydney, Sir Henry, 600.

Tadcaster, rebels at, 98.
Talbot Edward, 334, 362, 451.
Talbot, Francis, 221, 290, 291, 323, 369, 472; has not seen the Queen of Scots for many years, 439; death of, 507.
Talbot, George, son of Gilbert, death of, 392.
Talbot, Gilbert, 14, 17, 289; reports conversation with Dr. Wilson, 290; letter to Shrewsbury, 291; M.P. for Derbyshire, 292; visits Lady Lennox, 350; wife confined, 355; complains of Shrewsbury's meanness, 366; affected in his head, 382 n.; attends Leicester at Buxton, 383; writes to Lady Shrewsbury, 390; describes childish ways of his son George, 392; death of George, 392; sees Queen Elizabeth "in her night-stuff," 409 n.; wife under care of Dr. Julio, delivers presents from his father to Burghley and others, 418; state of the odds on the Elizabeth-Alençon marriage, 419; Queen of Scots godmother to his child, 444; his wife confined, 490; quarrel with his father, 538, 586.
Talbot, Henry, 334, 451.
Talbot, John (see Shrewsbury); Talbot, Earl, 14 n.
Talbot, Lady Grace, 18, 365.
Talbot, Mary, nèe Cavendish, wife of Gilbert, 490, 555.
Talbot, Mary, wife of Sir George Savile, 519.
Tassis, Juan-Batista de, Spanish representative at Paris, 461; opinion of Mary's projects, 463; communications with Jesuit plotters, 496; thinks demands of Lennox absurd, 498; engaged in the invasion plot, 501; disgusted with the Pope's niggardliness, 533; writes to Philip on the disclosure of the Catholic conspiracy, 542; discusses projects for invading England or Scotland, 580.
Templeborough, near Rotherham, *mentioned*, 145.
Teulet, Alexandre, "Correspondance diplomatique de Bertrand de Salignac de la Mothe Fénélon, 1568 à 1575," edition 1840; quoted 22, 23, 34, 39, 50, 78, 79, 89, 319-21, 329, 348-50, 354, 358-60.
Teulet, Alexandre, "Relations politiques de la France et de l'Espagne avec l'Ecosse au XVIe Siècle," edition 1862, *quoted*, 19, 39, 50, 86, 133, 167, 360, 361, 362, 368, 372-73, 377, 402, 404, 409-11, 416-17, 420, 423, 426, 428-31, 434, 436, 439, 448, 454, 457, 461-64, 466, 495, 498-503, 505, 514-15, 530, 533-34, 539, 541-43, 545, 581; note on Mendoza, 544.
Teulet's "Supplément au recueil du Prince Labanoff," edition, 1859; *quoted*, 375, 466, 500, 501, 503, 580.
Throckmorton, Francis, Catholic conspirator, arrested, 542; tortured, 543.
Throckmorton, George, son of Francis, 542.
Tibault, Livingstone's boy, 186 n.
Topcliff bells rung backwards, 98.
Torture, in Scotland, 485; in England, 178, 214, 543.
Treaty, proposed terms of, 118, 160; note of, 127, 161; confirmation of treaty of Edinburgh demanded, 128; Mary desirous of, 166; summary of, 530; Mary's protests of sincerity in, 548; failure not to be attributed to Mary, 565; negotiations renewed with Waad, 568; with Beale, 578; broken off, 579; Walsingham thinks negotiations may be renewed, 582; Mary anxious to make an end of, 583.
Tucker, Stephen I., Rouge Croix, *quoted*, 151 n.
Turnbull, William, "Letters of Mary Stuart," edition 1845; *quoted*, 90, 167, 171, 174, 209, 211, 218, 221, 338, 340, 342, 348, 356, 384, 401-2, 426, 433, 435, 438, 453, 537, 619.
Tutbury, 15, 19, 20, 21 n., 22, 23, 25, 26, 28, 30, 31, 88, 136, 144, 158; route from Bolton to, 25; Castle, its position; Mary describes it, 23; Mary's household utensils at, 25 n.; Mary arrives at, 33; her mode of life at, 39; N. White's visit, 40; Mary leaves, 57; returns, 83; proposed removal of Queen of Scots to, 377, 609; stable room, fuel, sea-coal and

wood at, 612; preparations at, 613; Somer's report on, 614; arrival of Queen of Scots at, 618.

Vargas, De., Spanish ambassador at Paris, 429, 430, 431, 434, 439, 460.
Vassal, M., servant of La Mothe, 297.
Vavassor, John, 26.
Veal, price of, 612.
Verger, Du, Mary's chancellor, visits Sheffield, 297, 381, 410; Queen of Scots sponsor for his child, 357; *mentioned*, 305, 327, 330, 383, 397.
Victuals, price of, 611.
Vincennes, Mary compares Tutbury to, 24.

Waad, William, clerk of the Council, visits Sheffield, 568.
Wages, rate of, soldiers, 610.
Walmesley, an innholder, prosecuted for uttering scandals against Shrewsbury and Mary Stuart, 608.
Walpole, Horace, *quoted*, 205 n., 536 n.
Walsingham, Sir Francis, 93; note in his diary, 158; concludes treaty with France, 259; Secretary of State, 296; suggests forgery of letters, 314; writes Shrewsbury about his servants, 355; Journal, *quoted*, 364; abstracts hoods from Queen of Scots' boxes, 370; consulted about the succession, 373; drafts letter of extravagant thanks, 385; urges Shrewsbury to extra care, 399; intercepts Mary's letters, 401; orders arrest of Jailhéur, 437; advises Shrewsbury, 458; desires specific proposals from Mary, 481; communicates Elizabeth's answers to Mary's complaints, 512; Mary's opinion of, 529; on the track of discoveries, 535; bribes several people, 535; writes of Elizabeth's grief at the death of Anjou, 581; present at Council meeting, 600; suggests Sadler's servants should be furnished with "dagges and petronells," 603.
Walton, near Chesterfield, Mr. Foljambe's house, 33 n.
Watch, a curious, description of, 370.
Waterhouse, Henry, of Onesacre, 236.
Warr, Lord de la, a commissioner to question the Queen of Scots, 262.
Waytes, an English priest, 468.
Weatherby, 25, 26; Queen of Scots sleeps at, 28; rebels at, 98.
Wentworth, Thomas, of Wentworth, 204.
West, ensign bearer, 2.
Westminster, conference at, 13.
Westmoreland, Earl of, raises rebellion, 98.
Wharncliffe, the Earl of, 318 n., 506 n.
Wharton, Charles, 441.
Wharton, Wm., the devices of, 309-17.
Wheat, price of, 611.
White, Nicholas, visits Mary, 40.
White, Robert, "Worksop, the Dukery and Sherwood Forest," edition 1875, *quoted*, 16.
Wilcoxon, Henry, soldier, 236.
Wilford, Mr., 2, 9.
Will of the Queen of Scots, 380.
William, the Sumlyer, 35 n.
Wilson, Doctor, Secretary of State, 262, 321, 455, 458.
Winchester, the Marquis of, *mentioned*, 119.
Wine, consumption of, by Queen of Scots and her train, 612.
Wingfield Manor, 15, 26, 33, 51, 52, 144, 539; rooms assigned the Bishop of Ross, 56; proposed removal of Mary to, 585; Mary's journey to, 592; arrangement of the house, 604; Mary departs from, 616.
Wingfield, Mr., Shrewsbury's servant, 19.
Winter, severe, 1571, 163.
Winzet, Niniane, a priest, 186 n.
Wood, Anthony, *quoted*, 608.
Workington, Mary lands at, 1.
Worksop Manor, 15, 144; note on, 536 n.; Queen of Scots removed to, 529; a second visit 536; her treatment at, 537.
Wolsey's, Cardinal, visit to Sheffield Manor, *mentioned*, 151.
Wombwell, Mr., named gentleman porter by Shrewsbury, 605.
Wortley, Francis, 205, 317 n.; suggested as temporary guardian of the Queen of Scots, 506.
Wortley, near Sheffield, note on, 205 n.; 318 n.
Wright, Thomas, "Queen Elizabeth and her times," edition 1838, *quoted*, 2, 5, 8, 9, 45, 49, 265, 363, 609.
Writing, secret, receipt for, 550; Queen of Scot's mode of letter, 331.
Wyllson, Haltenge, 254.

York, the conference at, 9, 13, 27.
Yorkshire, inclined to old religion, 23.

Zouche, Sir John, 60 n.; ordered to assist Shrewsbury, 67; sent for again, 69; attending, 70; a person of "trust and strength," 604.
Zuniga, Don Diego de, Spanish ambassador at Paris, 360.

LEADER AND SONS, PRINTERS, SHEFFIELD.

te Due

BOSTON COLLEGE
3 9031 01213648 7

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

Leadez, J. D. 4236

BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.

Books may be kept for two weeks and may be renewed for the same period, unless reserved.

Two cents a day is charged for each book kept overtime.

If you cannot find what you want, ask the Librarian who will be glad to help you.

The borrower is responsible for books drawn on his card and for all fines accruing on the same.